THE Lutheran Quarterly

Volume XIII NOVEMBER, 1961 Number 4

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Managing Editor
FRED W. MEUSER
Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Columbus, Ohio

Book Editor
ARNOLD E. CARLSON
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

Circulation Manager
LOWELL J. SATRE
Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Gettysburg, Pa.

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, Pa.

Augustana Theological Seminary
Rock Island, Ill.

Capital University Theological Seminary
Columbus, Ohio

Wartburg Theological Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

Luther Theological Seminary
St. Paul, Minn.

Augsburg Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Central Seminary
Fremont, Neb.

Chicago Lutheran Seminary
Maywood, Ill.

Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada
Waterloo, Ont.

Grandview Seminary
Des Moines, Iowa

Hamma Divinity School
Springfield, Ohio

Lutheran Seminary
Saskatoon, Sask.

Northwestern Lutheran Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Lutheran Southern Seminary
Columbia, S. C.

Suomi Seminary
Maywood, Ill.

Trinity Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

Pacific Lutheran Seminary
Berkeley, Calif.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume XIII November, 1961 Number 4

CONTENTS

THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT AS FULFILLMENT OF THE REFORMATION — *Frederick K. Wentz* 289

ECUMENICITY AT THE GRASS ROOTS — *C. Umhau Wolf* 298

RETREAT FROM THE WORD OR RETURN TO IT? — *John Reumann* 308

A STUDY OF CONTEMPORARY LUTHERAN PREACHING — *William Backus* 322

THE ARNOLDSHAIN THESES ON THE LORD'S SUPPER IN RECENT DISCUSSION — *Egil Grislis* 333

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Sellers, *The Outsider and the Word of God* (R. P. Roth) — 356
Winter, *The Suburban Captivity of the Churches* (K. H. Hertz) — 357
Kloetzli, *The City Church: Death or Renewal* (K. H. Hertz) — 357
Littell, *The German Phoenix* (T. A. Kantonen) — 359
Forell et al., *Luther and Culture* (L. Dale Lund) — 360
Harrisville, *Newness in the New Testament* (R. A. Bartels) — 361
Myers et al., eds., *Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman* (H. D. Hummel) — 362
Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (O. K. Storaasli) — 363
Russell, *Between the Testaments* (O. K. Storaasli) — 365
Sanders, *The Old Testament in the Cross* (M. W. Leesburg) — 365
Bruce, *The English Bible* (W. C. Linss) — 366
Barclay & Bruce, eds., *Bible Guides* (R. D. Snyder) — 366
Pearson, *Hear our Prayer* (G. R. Seltzer) — 368
Meyer, *This Faith Is Mine* (R. D. Heim) — 368
Ricard, *Seven Times He Spoke* (C. Johnson) — 368
Elliott, *The Efficiency Filing System* (P. M. Lindberg) — 368
Diem, *Dogmatics* (R. Werner) — 369
Berkouwer, *Divine Election* (W. J. Kukkonen) — 369
Barth, *The Humanity of God* (A. E. Carlson) — 370
Harland, *The Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr* (W. H. Lazareth) — 371
Whitehead, *Process and Reality* (C. Fjellman) — 371
Cannon, *History of Christianity in the Middle Ages* (H. J. Grimm) — 372
Crownfield, *Historical Approach to the New Testament* (N. K. Bakken) — 373
Franzmann, *The Word of the Lord Grows* (N. L. Norquist) — 374

INDEX TO VOLUME XIII — iii

CONTRIBUTORS

Frederick K. Wentz is professor of Historical Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Gettysburg.

Carl Umhau Wolf is pastor of St. Paul's Church (American Lutheran) in Toledo, Ohio.

John Reumann is professor of the New Testament in the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia.

William Backus is pastor of Faith Church (Missouri) in Pleasant Hill, California.

Egil Grislis is assistant professor of Historical Theology in the Divinity School of Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

Among the reviewers of books are Robert Paul Roth, professor of Systematic Theology in Northwestern Seminary, Minneapolis; Karl H. Hertz, professor of Sociology in Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio; T. A. Kantonen, professor of Systematic Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; L. Dale Lund, president of Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kansas; Robert A. Bartels, associate professor of the New Testament in Northwestern Seminary; Horace D. Hummel, associate professor of the Old Testament in Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa; Martin W. Leesberg, professor of the Old Testament in Luther Seminary, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada; Wilhelm C. Linss, professor of the New Testament in Central Seminary, Fremont, Nebraska; Russell D. Snyder, professor of the New Testament in the Lutheran Seminary in Philadelphia; George R. Seltzer, professor of Liturgics in the same; Ralph D. Heim, professor of Christian Education in the Lutheran Seminary in Gettysburg; Clair Johnson, instructor in Religion in Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minnesota; Walter J. Kukkonen, professor of Systematic Theology in Chicago Seminary, Maywood, Illinois; William H. Lazareth, associate professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Seminary in Philadelphia; Carl Fjellman, academic dean in Upsala College, East Orange, New Jersey; Harold J. Grimm, professor of History in Ohio State University, Columbus.

The Ecumenical Movement as Fulfillment of the Reformation

By Frederick K. Wentz

THIS is an interpretive essay on the development of the Ecumenical Movement. It carries the following thesis: The Ecumenical Movement makes up what the Reformation lacked or renews what Protestantism has lost; hence it is a fulfillment of the Protestant Reformation.

When the World Council of Churches at New Delhi is broadening itself by inclusion of the International Missionary Council, the Russian Orthodox Church, and Pentecostal groups, it is surely timely to ask what the Ecumenical Movement means for classical Protestantism. In fact, since this movement is the most important event in church history in our century, we stand steadily under the necessity of asking what God is saying to us in this particular puzzling, promising, threatening word to the churches of the twentieth century.

In this essay let us consider the four notes of the church (from the Nicene Creed) as we characterize the development of the Ecumenical Movement in terms of three phases, namely, 1910-1937, 1937-1952, and 1952 to today. No effort will be made to define these notes with theological precision or to cover all aspects of this complex movement.

I. Unity

The major Reformers of the conservative Reformation were quite concerned about maintaining the unity of the church. It seems fairly obvious that the modern Ecumenical Movement is a partial fulfillment of the Reformation in this respect.

In the first phase of the Ecumenical Movement unity among Christians was demanded primarily out of concern for the field of operation in view of the denominational confusion both in America and especially on foreign mission fields. This was the period of "a united front," when men stressed the "scandal of divisions." It was maintained that

in order to have a powerful witness on foreign fields and in society as a whole the age demanded that the churches get together. Within the Ecumenical Movement one might say that this was the heyday of the "ecumeniacs" who insisted that the denominations should unite immediately for greater power.

In this earliest phase and until today there have also been many pragmatists within the movement who have primarily sought for inter-denominational and international cooperation in the pursuit of common tasks. This approach has provided real undergirding for other aspects of the movement throughout its history.

But the second phase of the Ecumenical Movement, from 1937 to 1952, brought a deeper concern for Christian unity. The year 1937 marks the year when the movement hailed the rediscovery of the church under the slogan, "Let the church be the church." At the Life and Work conference at Oxford there was a new discovery of the social reality of the church. At the Faith and Order conference at Edinburgh the theological reality of the church's unity was re-discovered. It was stressed that the church's very nature calls for unity that our spiritual unity is given, and that we must embody it, witness to it, and seek its meaning. Lutherans, who had for the most part reacted against the tendency to shape church union by external pressures, now found themselves in growing agreement with the theological emphasis set forth at these conferences and predominating in the movement for the following fifteen years. This was the period within the movement when the denominations were oriented primarily toward each other, viewing each other as separated churches with differing traditions. At Edinburgh in 1937 the participants started to probe theological differences, especially concerning the ministry and the sacraments. At Amsterdam in 1948 theologians were joined by "ecclesiastical wheel-horses." Here the *churches* started to ask, What is our unity as the church? Thus began a serious probing of the separate traditions *together.*

It is highly probable that the impact of neo-orthodoxy had made it possible once more for the various denominations to undertake such a serious discussion of the nature of the church. Liberalism was not interested in the doctrine of the church, and various conservatives were too defensive in stance to ask the right questions seriously at

his point. The changed world situation and a third theological stream broke up this impasse.

The Faith and Order conference at Lund in 1952 marks a significant turn into the third phase of the movement, consisting of the last decade. Here it was proclaimed that further study of our differences would be sterile, and that churchmen both in study and in life, both in ecumenical and in denominational activity, must seek seriously to return to our common source, namely, Christ. This has proved a fruitful turning point during at least the decade until the present. Anders Nygren hailed this shift as a great hour for Lutheranism, which has always insisted that we ought to return together to our common source, Christ.

The impact which this shift has had upon our search for unity in the past decade was evidenced quite clearly at the Oberlin Conference of 1957 and by Albert C. Outler's book, *The Christian Tradition and the Unity We Seek*. Here is the emphasis that behind our traditions is *the tradition,* God's tradition (the word means "handing over"), God's *handing over* of Jesus Christ to share our existence and to effect our salvation (Rom. 8:32). This renewed insight in many different forms has enabled churchmen to view the various denominational traditions from a fresh perspective and with greater openness for finding common ground. It has also highlighted the fact that the church's unity is closely interwoven with the other three notes.

II. Holiness

The church is holy because it is a people called by God through Jesus Christ from their lesser commitments and possessed by the Holy Spirit for commitment to that Christ. At the Reformation this meant a call forth from the too great involvement in certain religious institutions and traditions. Similarly a strong feature of the Ecumenical Movement has been the cry for *renewal* of the church by the Holy Spirit, including a radical reassessment of our religious institutions and traditions.

This cry emerged during the second period and became explicit at Evanston in 1954. Thus renewal joined mission and unity as keywords in the movement. When in 1937 theologians started to face

together the differences in their traditions, this involved self-criticism. When in 1948 the *churches* became involved in such encounters of differing traditions, this involved a more serious self-appraisal.

While this new ability to sift traditions critically is a gift of the Holy Spirit, it is important to mention several of the contributing factors. These same decades have brought to many Protestants a more valid historical understanding of the meaning of tradition. We have realized more fully that one can reevaluate and reinterpret one's own tradition in applying it to the modern situation without repudiating that heritage or denying its validity in past ages. Existentialism has also had a salutary influence at this point, not only in its emphasis upon the role of dialogue in finding truth, but also in its assertion that truth is meaningful truth only in the particular circumstances and context where a given individual or tradition stands. That is to say, existentialism makes it possible for people with different viewpoints to say that there is validity and truth in each of these viewpoints.

In 1952, at Lund, there was a turning not only to the source, Christ, but also toward renewed study of the role of the Holy Spirit in the church—seeking correction for all our traditions. This is the very Protestant principle itself, the so-called critical principle which refuses to absolutize any earthly manifestation of God's will. Now it is being applied to denominational traditions often unquestioned for centuries. Here is the Reformation carried into the twentieth century. It is not surprising that by Evanston, 1954, the trend toward ecumenicity included a call for renewal of the church, for a re-formation of church life, and for a new wrestling with God's Word just as Luther did four centuries earlier. The Ecumenical Movement in the twentieth century serves as a continuation of the sixteenth century Reformation in terms of the holiness of the church.

III. Catholicity

It also represents the catholicity of original, classical Protestantism. The critical principle easily degenerates into divisive sectarianism unless it finds some catholic substance for the faith. Original Protestantism had that catholic substance. But from 1700 to 1900, during the so-called Protestant Era—really the era of the Enlightenment—a new

vave of Protestantism became dominant: the heart-religion of Evangelcalism and a tolerant, rational liberalism. Evangelicalism mothered the lenominational pattern and the missionary thrust from which the Ecumenical Movement emerged. Indeed, we owe much to this new vave of Protestantism. But it was fatally individualistic, washing the hurch away into purely individual commitment. Even the nineteenth entury missionary movement and the social gospel movements were rimarily individuals carrying the Gospel, not the church spreading he life of the church.

Now the Ecumenical Movement represents the recovery of churchiness in Protestantism. Here is a new emphasis on community, on he means of grace, on the objective church which stands over against he individual, on the richness of tradition. This recovery of our eritage brings us back to our origins and the time and place where ve were closest to catholicism. This process has gone on through all he discussions of the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's in the Ecumenical Movement. But the 1950's have seen a particular emphasis on the atholicity, that is, wholeness of Protestantism. This comes close to he meaning of ecumenicity, i.e., the search for wholeness, the transormation of sectarians (whether Protestant, Orthodox, or Roman) nto people concerned for catholicity.

Certainly the Ecumenical Movement has meant a mighty shakingogether within mid-twentieth century Christianity. There have been heological discussions across all lines. Ecumeniacs and sectarians have net and discussed; Protestants and Catholics have met and discussed; here have been contacts across iron curtains; there have been contacts etween activists and eschatologists, between free churchmen and tuffy bishops, between revivalists and liturgists.

Here one must recognize a generous assist from the liturgical enaissance. This movement has found Roman Catholics, for example, ducating their laity for worship through Bible reading. Protestants f all stripes have been recovering richness of worship and the hisoric symbols of the Christian cultus. Putting the altar near the center f the congregation helps to break up easy distinctions of high and ow in forms of worship. And the liturgical renaissance has itself been n interdenominational community.

Of course, the Ecumenical Movement itself has not been Protestant alone. The participation of branches of Orthodoxy from the beginning has challenged Protestantism to face its limitations within a broader Christianity. Now the careful approaches to the Russian Orthodox Church and its application for membership in the World Council bring a new opportunity for followers of the Reformation to assess the catholic substance of their faith. Of equal importance in this respect is the swelling tide of interest in the past decade in discussion and encounter with Roman Catholics. In these ways and others this movement is helping to bring Protestantism back to the catholicity of the Reformers.

IV. Apostolicity

A still more significant trend within the Ecumenical Movement fits under the rubric of the fourth note of the church, apostolicity. When Lund, 1952, pointed to our source, Christ, research into Christology soon pointed out that he was God's apostle, the one sent from God as God's mission to the world. Clearly, then, his Body, the church, is also sent from God to the world. This is its apostolicity, namely, that the church *is* mission. And when men began to search the tradition behind the tradition they came to the same answer. Whereas Catholics find the church's apostolicity in the unbroken historic succession of bishops back to the apostles, and Protestants find apostolicity in the same pure confession as that of the apostles, actually behind both succession and confession lies *mission*. The church is truly apostolic when it is possessed by the same mission as was the original apostolic church. This has provided a fresh start on a formerly quite divisive issue, namely, confession versus succession.

Not that missions is a new emphasis within ecumenicity. The missionary movement fathered the Ecumenical Movement, and that movement has been considered the more churchly twentieth century form of the great nineteenth century missionary movement. But now mission is the term used to define the church, its source, and its purpose—Christ, God's apostle and his ongoing Body, the church, that Body God sends into the world *for* the world.

It is significant that the International Missionary Council and the World Council are just now merging, as they realize fully that they

erve the same purpose. Only in recent years has it become crystal clear hat unity and mission blend at the deepest point in the very nature of he church.

In our day much of the best ecumenical theology is formulated out f the mission situation itself—for example, in the forming and early fe of the Church of South India. Mention should be made of Lesslie Newbigin's *Household of God* (1953). This influential bishop of the Church of South India (and secretary of the IMC) has combined bibli- al theology, and its emphasis that we live between the times, with a tress upon eschatology and missions. He insists that the church must hink of itself an *in via,* on the way, a movement, a mission or task- orce, moving in two directions: (1) to the end of the age to meet its Lord, and (2) to the ends of the earth to proclaim that Lord's coming nd his salvation. This is in keeping with the symbol of the World Council—like a ship with a cross for its mast and yardarm, the Ecu- menical Movement makes fellow passengers of all people who recognize common destination and will gather at the foot of the cross.

But actually we must add a third dimension to Newbigin's church *n via.* The true church moves out in pilgrimage in three ways—to the nd of the age, to the ends of the earth, *and* to the church's end or pur- ose for the world, namely, the world's redemption—proclaiming the Lordship of Christ over this whole world. Here is the reintroduction of ocial concern at the deepest level of ecumenical experience.

And here is another highly significant movement within the Ecu- menical Movement—the lay renaissance.

The lay renaissance takes visible form in the *Kirchentag* move- ment, in the Evangelical Academies and half a hundred other European ay academies, and in such North American lay training centers as Parishfield, Five Oaks, Kirkridge, the Austin Faith and Life Com- munity, Packard Manse, Wainright House, and Yokefellow House. It enters in the Department on the Laity of the World Council (until recently sparked by Hans-Ruedi Weber), from which issues some of the most vigorous theology in ecumenical circles.

The leaders of this movement hail the laity as the crucial shock- troops on the frontiers of the church's life as laymen seek to proclaim the Lordship of Christ in all the secular spheres into which they enter. Stressing that the church consists of the whole people of God and ful-

fills its nature just as much while dispersed in the world as when assembled for worship, these leaders are undertaking a new kind of training of laymen to help them to be the church as they go about all their daily round.

In a most significant way the Ecumenical Movement in this lay renaissance is now starting to fulfill what the Reformation sadly failed to accomplish—a fully rounded role for the laity in the church's total mission.

The Reformation had a doctrine of the priesthood of all believers but it never came to fruition in the conservative branch of Protestantism. And Protestantism, whatever the reasons, in its first two centuries lacked any missionary zeal either for spreading the Gospel to foreign lands or for penetrating and transforming European society.

This failure is to be seen in the very definition of the church which the Reformers gave. They called it "the congregation (or fellowship) of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught (or preached) and the sacraments are rightly administered." There are many good things about this definition, of course. But it fails to make clear that the purpose of the church is to proclaim the Word of God *to the world*. It enables us to narrow fatefully our picture of the church to a gathering of people on Sunday morning listening to preaching and receiving sacraments. It enables laymen to see their role as passive. But the Bible defines Christ and his church by their mission to the world, and all members are to proclaim the Good News.

This is no basic criticism of the Reformers. They had their own tasks to carry out, and this involved discerning a true church in the midst of a badly corrupted one. Thus they focused upon inner marks, marks evident to the faithful—preaching and sacraments. In our day of world-wide mission we discern the same true church by pointing to additional marks evident to unbelievers—suffering love and sacrificial service by the whole people of God.

Often we seek to distinguish the Reformation view from a sectarian view by saying that sectarians are intent upon finding the circumference of the church in order to exclude outsiders, whereas traditional Protestantism seeks the church's center, preaching and sacraments, and includes all who gather about these marks. We ought rather to reverse

he direction of our definition; we ought to think of the church as peo-
ple who are moving out from preaching and sacraments, carrying the
Word to the world.

The lay renaissance, in trying to add the dimension of missionary
purpose to the everyday life of laymen, is seeking to fulfill a crucial
aspect of the Reformation. Thus the Ecumenical Movement is rounding
out the note of apostolicity in the Reformation churches.

This article has sought to elaborate the thesis that the twentieth
century Ecumenical Movement is a fulfillment of the sixteenth century
Reformation. Three periods in the development of that movement have
been noted: (1) 1910 to 1937, when ecumenical concern was oriented
primarily toward the field of operation; (2) 1937 to 1952, when the
movement focused upon mutual study of one another by the churches;
and (3) 1952 until today, when ecumenicity has sought to center upon
our common source, Christ, understood as God's apostle to the world.
In terms of the church's *unity* this movement has been a real moving
forward. For the church's *holiness* this movement has meant a twenti-
eth century openness to receive what the Reformation richly re-
ceived. Through this movement twentieth century Protestantism is be-
ing brought back to the *catholicity* which is its heritage from the
conservative Reformation. In terms of the church's *apostolicity* this
movement promises a surge forward in an area where classical Prot-
estantism saw but dimly and accomplished very little, namely, the mis
sion of the whole church to the whole world.

Ecumenicity at the Grass Roots

By C. Umhau Wolf

THE title of this article comes from Gustave Weigel: "We must go to the grass roots, for the nearer the ecumenical movement comes to the soil of the commonality of believers, the greater are its prospects of achieving its high goal."[1] In several other places he has reviewed the history of ecumenism, especially in Protestantism.[2]

The word "ecumenical" has been used in three different dimensions.[3] In calling the Second Vatican Council an ecumenical council the pope is using the word in its narrow, technical Roman sense, i.e. a conference of all bishops of the Roman Church.[4] Most Protestants use the word in its widest sense, the approach of divided Christians toward one another, characterized by understanding, sympathy, and emphasis on search for the truth.[5] Rules for the dialogue of this broad type have been published simultaneously in Protestant and Roman journals.[6] Even Roman Catholics recognize that in the World Council of Churches and in Protestant mergers "a convergence of separated Christians is taking place."[7]

But for years the ecumenical movement was a Protestant phenomenon. The bishop of Rome stood aloof from these stirrings and did not recognize that in the Protestant spirit there was a longing to confront Roman Christians. So Weigel reports, "By and large the American non-Catholic is eager to enter into dialogue with the Catholic on a friendly basis. . . . Today the American non-Catholic also wants to en-

1 G. Weigel, *Faith and Understanding in America*, p. 170.

2 Cf. *A Catholic Primer on the Ecumenical Movement*. Also in *The Catholic World*, January 1960, pp. 224 ff.

3 L. Bouyer, "The Different Senses of the Word Ecumenical," *Unitas*, Spring 1959.

4 J. P. Kenny, "What Is Oecumenicity in Its Technical Sense?" *Irish Theological Quarterly*, July 1960, pp. 238 ff.

5 Henry St. John in preface to C. J. Dumont, *Approaches to Christian Unity*, p. 4.

6 R. M. Brown, "Rules for the Dialogue," *Christian Century*, Feb. 17, 1960, pp. 183 ff., from the book published later with Weigel, *The Protestant-Catholic Dialogue*.

7 T. Sartory, "The Contemporary Ecumenical Movement," *American Benedictine Review*, March-June 1959, p. 16.

counter the American Catholic *qua* Catholic. This feeling is actually stronger on the non-Catholic than on the Catholic side. It is certainly a good movement and it should be aided by all."[8]

In 1935 the Abbé Couturier began to speak of the need for understanding if the division of Christendom was to be healed. In 1937 Conger wrote on the Catholic principles of ecumenism. These studies marked the beginning of the now proliferating study of the "separated brethren" with a view toward unity. There were Catholic unoffical observers in Amsterdam in 1948, in Oberlin in 1952, and in Evanston in 1954. In 1960 a secretariat for Christian unity was established in Rome to keep Protestants and Eastern Orthodox informed of the new council, but also to keep Rome in touch with the "separated brethren." This official was present in his official capacity when the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches met in Scotland in August, 1960. Weigel has predicted that official observers from Rome would be present in New Delhi in 1961. Dr. Franklin C. Fry is quoted by *Time* as saying that this is Roman recognition of the World Council as basically Christian.[9]

A decade ago it was said, "The question, Christian or non-Christian, had now become so acute that the older alternative, Catholic or Protestant, had lost its urgency in comparison."[10] The Nazi and Communist pressures may be responsible for this openness to one another. What if Russian and Chinese Communism and the cold war today are the threats behind the newest recognition? Did not the Lord use Assyria to do His will in Israel? There is no doubt that even for Roman Catholics, "The ecumenical idea is a provoking one, and Christendom is more alive to it now than ever before. . . . The official pronouncements of the Holy See, the pastoral letters of not a few Catholic bishops, the sympathy and active participation of many individual Catholics, all point to the fact that the unity-seeking movements in world Protestantism are followed by the Church of Rome with keenest interest, far more so than had hitherto been known."

In Germany the Una Sancta movement is the official stage for dialogue between Catholics and Protestants. Because of the re-evalua-

8 Weigel, *Faith and Understanding*, p. 68.
9 *Time*, August 29, 1960.
10 E. W. Zeeden, *The Legacy of Luther*, p. 214.

tion of the Reformation by Catholics, the increased common interpretation of Scriptures, and the lay revival,[11] Max Metzger started the Una Sancta movement in 1938. He was executed by the Nazis in 1944, but meetings of Protestants and Catholics continued in Germany, and in 1946 a periodical, *Una Sancta Rundbriefe,* appeared as a forum for Roman, Eastern, and Protestant Christians. The institution has encouraged public forums and scholarly lectures and was responsible for the book which contained the published lectures of Karl Adam, *One and Holy.* In 1952 the Benedictine Thomas Sartory became the Catholic leader, and since 1956 his abbey has been host for the meetings of the conferences.[12] Many Lutheran participants who are not connected with the re-union efforts of Lackmann and Assmussen praise the movement.

In 1945 the Unitas Association was founded in Rome. It encourages Catholics to show Protestants the life of the spirit. It invites Protestants to cooperate, and Eastern Orthodox to recognize their theological unity with Rome. It keeps in close touch with the ecumenical movement everywhere. Basically, however, this is a Roman organization whose ultimate aim is reunion, not dialogue, nor even ecumenicity in the broad sense of the word.

In 1947, under the leadership of both Catholic and Lutheran bishops, fourteen Protestant and fourteen Roman theologians gathered for a conference in Paderborn. They soon began to meet regularly. In 1957 a special Institute was established there in order to permit Catholic specialists to study and observe Protestant theology. One of the books resulting from such study is on Karl Barth's conception of justification.[13] The name is a real misnomer, especially in English: "Institute for Controversial Theology." A smaller but parallel development was the establishment in 1960 by the Lutheran World Federation of an "Interconfessional Research Department" under Danish theologian Skydsgaard. Recently the University of Louvain established a chair of ecumenical theology, and a rotating staff of Protestant theologians

11 Cf. C. U. Wolf, "Reform in Roman Catholicism," The Lutheran Quarterly, XIII (1961), pp. 47-66.

12 L. Swindler, "Ecumenicism in Germany," *Commonweal,* Jan. 22, 1960, p. 465.

13 H. Kung, *Rechtfertigung.* Cf. K. Barth, "Recapitulation Number Three," *Christian Century,* Jan. 20, 1960, pp. 72 ff.

will be visiting lecturers. This is said to be the first time a non-Roman will be teaching theology under Catholic auspices.[14]

In Germany some of the life of the original Una Sancta movement has been dissipated. In the field of biblical study so many areas of agreement were found that there was little interest. In fact, some went out of their way recently to draw up and circulate "Twelve Theses" listing areas of conflict for further discussion. The reduction of political pressure and the freedom of the churches in West Germany made for institutional competition and further slowed up the dialogue. A few, such as Lackmann, have practically started a new Protestant "Back to Rome Movement," and more conservative Lutheran bishops and pastors have drawn the reins up tighter. However, in the United States we are still in the beginnings and there is no satiation as yet. Many Roman bishops are still cautious, and many Protestant ministers are skeptical.

Before delineating some of the ecumenical techniques, the hopes, both explicit and implicit, in much of the dialogue should be noted. Weigel has listed three major and incompatible hopes.[15] As with the Unitas Association, the majority of Roman Catholics hope for reunion or, using a more distasteful word, "conversion." This is the goal of the Paulist Fathers, the Graymore Friars, and the Unitas Association, and this aim is represented by Van de Pol's *The Christian Dilemma* and Fenton's writings in the *American Ecclesiastical Review*. It is this hope which prompts the Catholic press to give bold headlines to Hans Asmussen's *Der Sammlung* and to Lackmann's call for Lutheran bishops to return to Rome. Above all, this is the hope of the present pope, who daily lights a candle and prays for the reunion of the church. His encyclicals, *Questa Festiva* and *Ad Petri Cathedram*, state that this is the goal of the Second Vatican Council, especially in respect to the Eastern Orthodox churches. But Weigel says that this is an impossibility, and Villain writes, "Return is an illusion."

A second hope is that of union by compromise. All may become one by emphasizing the common denominator of theology and practice. This is the hope of the Unitarians and some of the liberal elements

14 S. J. Wylie, "Reformation and Roman Christians in Dialogue," *Religion in Life*, Spring, 1960, p. 222.

15 Weigel, in *Catholic World*, January 1960, pp. 224-229.

in the World Council of Churches. But "the differences between the extremes in any one church are sometimes more marked than those between the Catholic Church and the original Reformation."[16] There is no real hope that union can be achieved through compromise, at least not in the name of Christ, who would himself never accept compromise. Conservative Protestants and Catholics reject this possibility.

A third hope is that all the world might follow the pattern of the Church of South India. At the 1960 meeting of the National Council of Churches such a merger of four great Protestant denominations was made a press bonanza. Comprehension is the label applied to the South India and Blake dreams. There would be union in spite of doctrinal differences which would continue and questions of order which would remain undetermined. The struggle of Congregationalists to merge with the Evangelical and Reformed is a mild evidence of the problems connected with such a merger. Dialogue with Roman Catholics would be almost impossible in such an instance. This is one of the difficulties with the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Jews and Catholics on the platform usually know where they stand, but the Protestant representative represents nobody but himself. Frequently the Protestants selected for debate are from those favoring the second goal and who represent the humanistic values of Christian culture and not a biblical or confessional position. "The liberals are far more friendly and more cordial, but the Catholic is appalled by their radical reconstructions of Christianity. It is easier and more pleasant to talk to a neo-liberal than to a fundamentalist, but there is a greater community of dogmas—for different reasons—in a fundamentalist-Catholic encounter."[17]

The one realistic hope which all Spirit-filled leaders, both Protestant and Catholic, accept is that the outcome and ultimate form, even of the church, will be determined by the workings of the Holy Spirit. "It is not for us but for the Lord to bring unity."[18] "Only God can overcome division."[19] And Skydsgaard speaks from the other side,

16 W. H. Van de Pol, *The Christian Dilemma,* p. 27.

17 Weigel, *Faith and Understanding,* p. 69.

18 Weigel, *Catholic World,* p. 229.

19 B. Leeming, "Principles of Catholic Ecumenism," *Unitas,* 1959, 104 ff. Cf. summary in *Theological Abstracts,* Autumn 1959, p. 144.

There is only one Holy Spirit, who creates unity and fellowship."[20] George Lindbeck, a member of the Lutheran World Federation's Committee on Interconfessional Research, put it this way: "We must grow ourselves into the encounter with Roman Catholicism motivated by a passionate desire to actualize the unity which is in Christ, willing to learn, to be challenged, to change, and yet have the courage to frustrate our deepest longings to say 'no' for the sake of truth."[21]

Christian love is not only the first principle but also the first technique for grass roots ecumenism. The best definition of dialogue is that of George Tavard: "Through dialogue one person does not seek to annihilate another, nor even to understand another in the sense in which one understands an object by grasping it. . . . By dialogue a person seeks not to grasp but to commune, to open himself to another, to enter into the other who has reciprocally opened his mind and heart to him. For human beings dialogue is thus developmental."[22] It does not advance the Christian witness in a non-Christian world to speak the truth without love. It is possible that American Protestants are now acquiring the ghetto defensiveness of a threatened minority about the same time that Roman Catholics are emerging from it. With the potential of reform and the power of the Holy Spirit one cannot build syllogisms on past practices or even enunciated principles and conclude what will be done next year. What is gained for truth or Christian charity by the statement that there was in "the Roman Church in the past a reluctance to encourage the general reading of Scriptures."[23] The truth must be spoken in love even while differences are clearly revealed. Antagonistic polemic is no longer called for. "Roman Catholics and Protestants have each in their own way been tempted to dismiss each other with certain established battle clichés that in the course of time have acquired an almost magical power over the

20 K. E. Skydsgaard, *One in Christ*, p. 5. Cf. his article "On Dialogues Between Roman Catholic and Evangelical Lutheran Theologians," *Lutheran World*, Sept. 1960, pp. 26 ff.

21 National Lutheran Council News Release, Feb. 24, 1960. Cf. the original title of Skydsgaard's book, "Yes and No."

22 Quoted in W. Ong, *American Catholic Crossroads*, p. 32. Cf. G. Tavard, *The Church, the Layman and the Modern World*, and "Catholicity and Non-Catholic Christians," *Downside Review*, Summer-Autumn 1959, pp. 205 ff.

23 J. K. Reid, "The Bible and Modern Religions, XII: Roman Catholicism and the Bible," *Interpretation*, Jan. 1959, p. 72.

minds of men."[24] Talks, sermons, and dialogue discussions can all follow the principle of Tavard: "We must make our examination of Protestantism without reviving old quarrels or engaging in new disputes."[25] Or even more clearly he writes, "Before we reach the plane of dogmatic discussions, we therefore have to deaden the dangerous fire of personal or inherited antipathies, to overcome the itch that each feels at the religious ethos of the other, to end polemics inspired by mutual irritation rather than by Christian love."[26]

"Getting to know you" is not only a song title but also a useful technique in ecumenical dialogue, especially at the grass roots. So far in America there has been no official encouragement of Catholic parish priests to enter the dialogue, and in some areas Catholic bishops have prohibited any but trained professors to participate. Obviously a Protestant minister cannot get to know his Roman neighbor down the street if the bishop will not permit dialogue.

Nevertheless dialogue is not destroyed but only dismembered by such unilateral action. One can read and study the literature, books, periodicals, and tracts of the other. This can be done by individuals, conferences, and dialogue groups. "Information Catholique" in Geneva recommends to Catholics the reading of Skydsgaard's *One in Christ*. Weigel likewise recommends Pelikan's *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism*. Unhappily some Romans suggest that Weigel's own book, containing critiques of Catholicism by Protestants and Jews, should be prohibited to the laity. Protestants, should regularly read *Our Sunday Visitor, America* or *Commonweal,* and *Theological Digest*. If biblically oriented, they should at least know *New Testament Abstracts* and *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*. If theological studies attract, there are many journals by various orders worth reading, such as *Theological Studies, Dominicana,* and *Blackfriars*. If interested in what the average priest and religious reads one can try *Ave Maria, The Catholic World, The Catholic Mind, Homiletical and Pastoral Review*.

On the other hand, the ecumenically minded Roman Catholic ought to find interest in the *Ecumenical Review* or *Lutheran World*. The biblical minded priest will enjoy the *Journal of Biblical Literature and*

24 Skydsgaard, *op. cit.*, p. vi.
25 G. Tavard, *Protestantism,* p. 8.
26 G. Tavard, *The Catholic Approach to Protestantism,* p. xiii.

Exegesis and *Biblical Archaeologist* (not Protestant journals but the majority of articles are by Protestants). Theological studies are represented in many journals, such as *Theology Today, Journal of Religion, Religion in Life,* and a variety of denominational quarterlies. All ecumenically minded priests should follow the *Christian Century* and *Christianity Today* as well as at least one denominational paper. But this is for both just a modest, minimal beginning. "The dialogue which is confined to an exchange of books will be only half a dialogue."

Another half-dialogue in which the laity can participate is that of congregational or conference study groups or schools. Shortly after the first publicity on John XXIII's call for a new council, St. Paul's Lutheran Church in Toledo, Ohio, held an eight-week school of religion, according to custom, but one course was offered on "Ecumenical Councils." This course reviewed the major councils of the ancient church and then followed up with the later Roman councils. This course was well received by laymen and women. But history is not sufficient for the dialogue. Skydsgaard warns, "Neither the Roman Church nor the Lutheran is the same today as it was 400 years ago."[27] Other subjects and book reviews can be followed by Sunday school classes and study groups. Several Roman Catholic priests have spoken to Luther Leagues, Young Adults, and other groups with good results in understanding. A few fellow pastors objected to the unilateral dialogue: "They'd never invite you to speak to their people." This objection, however, seems to make of Christianity a tit-for-tat affair.

The first annual Ecumenical Institute of Toledo, sponsored by St. Paul's Lutheran Church, attracted wide attention. Reformation services of Toledo Lutherans as well as of the Council of Churches had more and more brought diminishing returns in the past decade. In 1958 only a small Missouri Synod rally remained, and that was all that was scheduled for 1959. It was felt that the time was ripe for a new approach. At first there was thought of a Reformation Institute, and Dr. Roland Bainton was invited to speak. His gracious refusal helped develop the ecumenical idea. Christopher Dawson, Roman Catholic lay professor at Harvard Divinity School, at first hesitated and

27 Skydsgaard, *op. cit.*, p. 27. Cf. Tavard, *Protestantism,* Daniel-Rops, *L'Eglise de la Renaissance et de la Reforme,* and Hughes, *A Popular History of the Reformation.*

then accepted an invitation. But about Easter time his secretary wrote that his heavy schedule had hampered his health and he was forced to curtail his activities. There was some suspicion that he had been pressured by the hierarchy, but such suspicions were unconfirmed. A quick letter, on a gamble, was sent to the leading Roman figure in the American Ecumenical movement, Father Gustave Weigel, S.J., of Woodstock (Md.) Seminary. He immediately replied and the institute was set.

Invitations were sent to all Council of Churches members and to a majority of the Toledo diocesan priests. On the last Thursday in October, 1959, the Institute was held. All together 99 Protestant clergymen, 1 Orthodox priest, 1 rabbi, and 35 Roman priests were present for the morning address and discussion. At a luncheon to which all were invited to be guests of St. Paul's, Weigel spoke informally and answered further questions from the floor. He chided those in charge for trying to save him embarrassment by having questions written at the morning session. At the luncheon, with good humor and *savoir faire,* he took on all oral questions straight from the floor. even dealing with church-state and parochial school issues.

In the evening some 250 lay members of St. Paul's heard approximately the same address and again freely asked questions. There was no doubt in the minds of any that this would be an annual affair. Several others in Toledo offered their personal or their church's help if necessary, but so far it remains the contribution of St. Paul's Lutheran Church to the ecumenical movement.

The plan is to alternate Roman and Protestant speakers. On the last Thursday in October, 1960, the Second Annual Institute was held with Dr. George Lindbeck as speaker. Professor Lindbeck was suggested as a follow-up by Weigel himself. The number of priests in attendance was higher. Two rabbis and two Eastern Orthodox clergymen attended, while the Protestant representation was about the same as the previous year. There had been some fear that the priests would not attend when the speaker was Protestant. This suspicion proved to be unfounded. The same format was followed each year. Lindbeck spoke on the re-evaluation of Thomism now going on in both Catholic and Protestant circles. The laymen were stimulated by "The Challenge of Roman Catholicism to the Protestant Church."

In planning for the Third Institute for October, 1961, clearance was made with the bishop. The first was held without ecclesiastical involvement or clearance, except by Father Weigel. The third has received the local bishop's informal clearance, and in a letter he wrote, "May I never be found interfering with the activities of the Holy Spirit."

The First Institute, through Weigel's suggestion saw the institution of grass roots discussion groups. Four groups of Protestant and Catholic clergymen met unofficially about once a month during 1959-60. Three were in Toledo and a fourth in the Detroit area. Many more were interested than finally became involved, but schedule difficulties were great. At the 1960 Institute reports were made from these groups and Lindbeck declared that they were absolutely unique in America. Everyone is convinced that the unofficial, informal character of these grass roots meetings must be protected. High-level discussions, as in Boston and San Francisco, leave the average pastor and priest out. Father Weigel feels that these small groups are more effective than a large association with various headquarters directing or cooperating. "We can meet effectively and cordially in many small local groups in which with Christian freedom and love we can speak our minds and hearts. . . . Small groups everywhere, inspired by love of neighbor and the church and equipped with competent theological guidance, can produce a climate in which reunion can germinate. The lack of formality would not mean total irresponsibility. . . . They [the participants] would in no sense be official and consequently they would be freer in their discussions. The smallness of the groups implies no disadvantage, for in small groups there comes a more intimate acquaintance with the group members, which would be an aid to charity that thrives on understanding."[28] This has been verified by our experiences.

28 Weigel, *Faith and Understanding*, p. 170.

Retreat from the Word or Return to It?

By John Reumann

ON THE B.B.C.'s Third Programme in spring of 1960 the American literary critic George Steiner presented a pair of lectures on the theme, "The Retreat from the Word."[1] "The Apostle tells us," he began, "that in the beginning was the Word. He gives us no assurance as to the end."[2] Then Steiner went on to make his own suggestions about the word today. He argued that the verbal character of our Western civilization has begun to break down. Words and rational language are giving way to a strange new world of symbol and formula, to non-verbal and anti-verbal languages.

All of us are more or less accustomed to the older view that "all truth can be housed in the walls of language."[3] It is the root assumption and genius of classical and Western civilization, espoused, for example, in the Code of Justinian, the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, and the *Divine Comedy* of Dante. But since the seventeenth century this view that reality is subject to rational language has increasingly been broken down. In mathematics, for example, while classical geometry can still be translated back into formal language, topology, a new branch of the science, cannot be. So too with chemistry. Molecular chemistry uses a shorthand whose vernacular is not that of common speech but of mathematics. In biology there is a shift from Darwinian descriptiveness to biochemistry with its formulae.

Surprisingly much the same thing has happened in history. Gibbon and Macaulay, who wrote with attention to style, are passé. Ever since Ranke, historians have sought to be scientists ferreting out "laws of history," and many nowadays take delight, in Steiner's phrase, "in writing . . . in as illiterate a style as possible in order to demonstrate the uncompromising scientific rigour of their subject."[4] The

1 Later published in *The Listener and B.B.C. Television Review* (London), Vol. LXIV, No. 1633 (July 14, 1960), 56-57, 60, and No. 1634 (July 21), 100 f.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 56.

3 *Ibid.*

4 *Ibid.*, p. 57.

social sciences, as we all know, are even worse: blessed is he who can reduce it all to charts and graphs and replace the verbal with the mathematical! Most amazing, the same influence operates in philosophy today. From the classical and medieval view that "words . . . could bring the mind into correspondence with reality," we moved to a turning point in Spinoza, whose *Ethics* sought to make the language of philosophy into "a kind of verbal mathematics," putting Q.E.D. after each proposition.[5] To understand philosophers today, like Whitehead or Russell, one must first be a mathematician, and Wittgenstein's conclusion is the ultimate result, "Ethics cannot be expressed." The retreat from the word ends in something vaguely mystical, other than the word.

Professor Steiner was particularly interested in the effect of this retreat upon literature today. Inevitably there is an effect upon craftsmen with words in this retreat from the view than language is "the vessel into which all reality is gathered."[6] Perhaps that is why the world of reality presented by a Hemingway is so much more limited (chiefly to bull-fighters, hunters, and alcoholic soldiers) than that of a Shakespeare when words were thought to be in complete command of reality. But by now one sees the point of Steiner's contention—all of us live in an age retreating from words and the logical clarity they express. Because we do not use words as meaningfully any more, there is almost an impatience with them. The outburst of Eliza Doolittle in *My Fair Lady* is symbolic in more ways than one. "Words, words, words, I'm so sick of words," she tells Professor Henry Higgins. "I get words all day through, first from him, then from you, is that all you blighters can do? . . . Show me! . . . If you're on fire, . . . show me."[7]

George Steiner's analysis of the retreat from the word makes no application to theology. But laying aside the obvious implication, that we must realize that God is always greater than our words and can never be imprisoned in our most carefully orthodox statements, there seems to be an obvious application that is abroad in the land. It

5 *Ibid*

6 *Ibid.*, p. 100. Steiner offers further examples from other disciplines and the arts to show how the world of the word has shrunk amid "the new illiteracy."

7 Alan Jay Lerner, "Show Me," *My Fair Lady*.

is often said, and rightly, of course, that we are living in an age when the sacrament is receiving new appreciation. This sacramental re-emphasis is often coupled with a retreat from the word, in the sense that there are shorter sermons, less preaching, but more ceremonial. The word having become vague, the focal point becomes "the Eucharist," for there, we are told, "something happens," there is action, not "just words." Advance to the sacrament is coupled with retreat from the word.

Such a reading of the evidence, it seems to me, is wrong, first because the rest of Christendom, if it is experiencing a liturgical and sacramental renewal, is also going through a return to the Word of God. Karl Barth and the whole mushrooming of biblical theology are part of it. So any "retreat from the Word" within Lutheranism, while the rest of the world is rediscovering it, would be a tragic misreading of what is going on. But this view is even more tragic because, secondly, it reflects a misunderstanding of what the Word of God is and its relation to words, and accordingly, where this misunderstanding always comes out, misconceptions about the sacraments. My contention would be that the current renaissance of biblical studies and the wide interest in biblical theology point not to retreat but to return to the Word, and that this return is important for us Lutherans precisely in areas where we are trying to understand our Christian faith more clearly. Here we need clear words about the Word. I point to four specimen areas where contemporary biblical scholarship has something to say.

I

The first has to do with the Word of God. We have all moved into a more dynamic conception of the Word than just a flat equation of it with the Bible. For American Lutherans the United Lutheran Church's Baltimore Declaration (1938) on the Word of God and the Scriptures marked something of a turning point, even if all Lutherans have not turned the corner yet, and Joseph Sittler's lectures on *The Doctrine of the Word,* in the Knubel-Miller series in 1948, sharpened the issue. The Word of God, Sittler argued, is "the biblical term for the fact *that* God reveals and *what* God reveals."[8] Accordingly it is customary

8 J. Sittler, Jr., *The Doctrine of the Word* (Philadelphia, 1948), p. 62.

o explain in popular terms that the Word of God is first Jesus Christ himself; second the message about Christ, which he brings; and third he Bible as the record of witness to that message. How does all that tand up against current biblical scholarship, where, in the words of Nils Dahl of Oslo, "as professional exegetes we no longer speak as lid the Reformers simply of 'God' and his 'Word.' Instead we make . study of the biblical concept of the word of God and of the under-tanding of the idea of God that emerges in the biblical writings."[9]

In the Old Testament there seem to be more references to the Word of God than in the New. In the Hebrew scriptures "the word of Yahweh" occurs nearly 400 times, and it is a realistic, dynamic con-ept. Underlying it is the notion that words accomplish something, nd God's word does not return void.[10] It is message, but also action, n acting message, for "the Hebrew mind," Edmond Jacob writes, "did not distinguish between thought and action" as we do.[11] Thus the Word is that through which God reveals himself, creative, in nature nd in history, involving both judgment and good news, what H. H. Farmer calls "the divine demand and the divine succor," working salvation.

In the New Testament the usual term for "word," *logos* occurs over 300 times, and *rhema,* another term, almost 70 more. Often these mean nothing more than "saying" or "speech," though at times the Old Testament sense carries over, and *logos* means revelation by God, or through Christ, or the Christian message itself.[12] The striking usage of the Word of God in the prologue of the Gospel of John (1:1-18) s not so significant, I fear, as we make it, for it does not reappear prominently in the rest of that gospel or elsewhere in the New Testa-ment.[13] Yet, I suspect, we construct much of our idea of the Word of

9 N. A. Dahl, "The Lutheran Exegete and the Confessions of His Church," *Lutheran World,* VI, 1 (June, 1959), p. 3.

10 For a brief survey cf. J. Y. Campbell, "Word," in Alan Richardson, *A Theological Word Book of the Bible* (New York, 1951), 283-285.

11 E. Jacob, *Theology of the Old Testament* (London, 1958), 128.

12 Cf. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament,* translated and adapted from W. Bauer's *Wörterbuch,* hereafter cited as "AGB" (Chicago, 1957), 478-480. The range of meanings there noted for *logos* includes "the Gospel," "preaching," "prophecy," "command," "teaching," and "pastoral counseling" and may be suggestive for discussions on the Word of God today.

13 Cf. J. Y. Campbell, *op. cit.,* p. 285: "This special use of the term *Logos* is confined to the Prologue. . . . [John's] *Logos*-conception . . . was determined by his previous thought

God primarily on the basis of those opening eighteen verses.

Does current biblical theology have anything to offer here? Contemporary scholarship has summed up much of the current understanding of God in the Scriptures in the phrase "the God who acts," as over against the God who is, a view of God as the one who speaks and acts in judgment and succor all through Israel's history and in the climactic action in Christ.[14] I suggest, therefore, that we ought to understand our theological formulation "the Word of God" as a kind of shorthand expression for the God who acts with words and deeds in the Old Testament, and uniquely then in Christ with words and deeds, and, of course, through the Spirit in his people till the end of time. "Word of God" is a technical expression we use for God speaking and acting, and, of course, also for the message about his mighty acts, and thirdly, also, for the Bible as the Book of the Acts of God.[15]

of Christ, and not his conception of Christ . . . by the *Logos*-conception." To say this does not mean agreement with the view, presented by J. Rendel Harris, C. F. Burney, and Bultmann, among others, that the evangelist here has incorporated some earlier (non-Christian?) hymn to the Logos. What is possible is that John "added the Prologue after the rest of the Gospel had been written," focusing his Christology and using *logos* "in a manner distinct from its meaning elsewhere," as V. Taylor puts it in *The Names of Jesus* (London, 1954), 162; cf. O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (London, 1959), 258 ff.

Recent studies, it is true, have stressed (rightly, I think) the backgrounds for the Logos doctrine in Jewish sources, not just Greek philosophy; the links with other New Testament passages like Col. 1:1-4, Heb. 1:1-3, and I John 1:1-4, even though "the Word" does not appear with the same precise meaning; and connections between the Prologue and the Fourth Gospel as a whole; cf. A. Corell, *Consummatum Est* (New York, 1958), 113 ff., and C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St John* (London, 1935), 61 f., 125 ff. Barrett emphasizes, however, it must be noted, that John, in applying *logos* to Jesus himself, rather than simply to the Christian message or *kerygma*, is taking "the last step of a process hinted at . . . by the rest of the New Testament" (p. 129). My point is that the equation from John 1 which we regard as *normative*, "The Word of God is fundamentally Jesus Christ," is really *climactic* for biblical thought; it ought to be viewed against the broad canvas of how terms like *logos* are used.

14 Cf. G. Ernest Wright, *God Who Acts* (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 8; London, 1952), especially the remarks on p. 12, and his discussion in "The Faith of Israel," *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York, 1952), I, 362. Also F. V. Filson, *Jesus Christ the Risen Lord* (New York, 1956), 10 ff., and G. E. Wright and R. H. Fuller, *The Book of the Acts of God* (Garden City, N. Y., 1957).

15 Such a formulation tries to do justice to the whole sweep of biblical references to "the word" and to the dynamic view there found of the Word of God as active, not static, while at the same time not putting an undue emphasis on John 1:1-18, more than the verses warrant in the total biblical picture. This formulation continues, of course, to recognize Jesus' life and work as the supreme example of God acting and therefore the supreme manifestation of the Word of God, but it seeks to regard the Logos precisely as commentators on the Fourth Gospel have recently put it: "the term Logos is seen to describe God in the process of self-

On this last point, it seems to me, we might be a little more positive than we often have been in the period in which we were still outgrowing biblicism. The Bible, it ought to be stated, is not just a record of man's response to God's actions, nor even just a witness to the revelation of what God has done. It is always an interpreted witness, never impartial, but committed; not just a reporter of God's words and deeds, but an interpreter of their significance as well. Thus at Pentecost —"these men are not filled with new wine," we are told, but God has poured out his Spirit in the Last Days, as he said he would in Joel. This is interpretation, not just reporting. So also with the Resurrection. Here indeed there is more emphasis on the interpretation than on describing the event itself. It is only with gnostic writings, like the *Gospel of Peter,* that we get attempts to depict the resurrection itself.[16] The canonical gospels do not "report" in this sense, but they witness to an empty tomb and risen Christ, and, most important, they tell us what this means: it is not that someone stole the body, or that, docetic-like, he never was crucified, but rather that Jesus died and was raised and lives, victor over death, the first fruits from the grave. Surely this is not just witness to events, but interpreted witnessing. And in this sense, I suggest, scripture is part of the revelation itself—not just a witness to historical events but a normative understanding for the people of God as to their meaning. It is Word of God.

II

A second difficult area where current biblical thought may have something to say to us concerns Word and sacraments. If we need a deeper understanding of the Word of God, how much more so with sacraments! At the bottom of some current confusion, I think, is a phrase in the Augsburg Confession, Article VII, that the church

communication" (Barrett, *op. cit.,* p. 61); "the Logos is the self-revealing, self-giving God — God in action. . . . By the very nature of the New Testament Logos one cannot speak of him apart from the action of God" (Cullmann, *op. cit.,* p. 266). The tendency to see the Word of God as denoting Jesus Christ personally develops in the church fathers and theologians out of John 1:1, 14 and Rev. 19:13, as T. Hewitt notes in *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, 1960), p. 90, but "such a connection of 'the word' with Christ came through the identification of the word of God with God's activity." On the whole topic see also James D. Smart, *The Interpretation of Scripture* (Philadelphia, 1961), especially 160 ff.

16 M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford, 1953), p. 92.

is where "the gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments rightly administered" (cf. also v and xiv). To oversimplify a view sometimes heard, "the gospel . . . taught" is by some equated with the Word and with preaching and is contrasted, not with sacraments, but specifically with the Lord's Supper. Then it is said, "So-and-so does not exercise a really complete ministry, he only preaches but does not celebrate the sacrament," as if members of a seminary faculty, for example, are not full-fledged ministers of the Word of God because they do not baptize. Or the misunderstanding takes the form, as I recently heard a Lutheran graduate student put it, "The church has two pillars, Word and sacrament."

If such traditional terminology must be used, it seems to me more accurate to say that the church has just one pillar, the Word of God —the God who speaks and acts in his grace to create and sustain his people—and then we may want to go on to spell out how this Word of God speaks and acts among us in preaching, sacraments, and believers' lives. If we do want to express the relationship between Word and sacraments, we should perhaps put it as in a recent common statement by Canadian Lutherans of seven different groups: "The Gospel," as "the central message of God's unchangeable Word . . . , the true, divine, saving means of grace," is what "gives to the sacraments . . . their saving power."[17] The Word, God speaking and acting, creates the sacraments, just as this same God creates his church. But in reality "Word and sacrament," as such, is not really a New Testament phrase, and perhaps it would be more fruitful for us to pay heed to emphases uncovered by biblical scholarship today.

One such emphasis certainly has to do with Baptism, among us the forgotten sacrament. It is in the New Testament the great sacrament of incorporation into Christ and his Body, something which Paul argues from, not a practice he argues for.[18]

17 Quoted in *Christianity Today*, IV, 25 (Sept. 26, 1960), p. 39.

18 Cf. Rom. 6:1 ff., 1 Cor. 1:13 ff., 12:13, Gal. 3:27. The lively debate and extensive literature about baptism and its meaning on the continent and in the British Isles is only beginning to be picked up in the United States. W. F. Flemington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism* (London, 1957), conveniently surveys exegetical discussion. O. Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament* (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 1; London, 1950), and J. Jeremias, *Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries* (Philadelphia, 1961), are answers against the position of Karl Barth. G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (London, 1951), reexamines

A second emphasis is on the variety of roots investigators have helped us see for the Lord's Supper, not merely a simple line from the Upper Room to later practice, but influence also from the fellowship meals of Jesus and the disciples in Galilee, from the agape-love feast in the earliest community, and from the "eschatological banquet" theme.[19] All these went into the sacrament which for Christians today still proclaims the Lord's death till he comes again.

Negatively, I think, a third emphasis: few of us can agree with Cullmann's finding that all distinctively Christian worship in the early church was eucharistic.[20] By no means do most scholars accept his reading of the evidence.[21] There must have been services of prayer, instruction, preaching, and evangelism which were distinctively Christian besides those set in the context of a fellowship meal.[22] On the positive side, for us the implication is the need for variety in worship and for utter clarity in good preaching which accompanies the Lord's Supper to make clear the meaning of the Word of God in this sacrament. Perhaps a parable in the Kierkegaardian manner will make clear

the relation to confirmation. J. A. T. Robinson's article, "The One Baptism as a Category of New Testament Soteriology," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 6, 3 (September, 1933), 257-274, considers Jesus' death on Golgotha as the "one baptism" for all men.

19 The statement above represents an impression derived from the host of opinions on the subject of "eucharistic origins" in recent literature, too extensive even to begin to list here. Any theory which would try to explain the Lord's Supper as developed in the ancient church, however, on the basis of only this or only that seems oversimplified. Form criticism shows that probably no account in the New Testament of what happened in the Upper Room is untouched by later churchly, liturgical interests; thus is to be explained the variations in the Verba. Obviously the eschatological emphasis was important and authentic. The fact that our accounts of the feeding miracles show reflections of the Lord's Supper I should regard as suggesting, not merely that the early church saw them as eucharistic (so many commentators) but that the Lord's Supper developed in part from those fellowship meals, both before and after the Resurrection. Lietzmann's old idea of two types of Lord's Supper demonstrable in liturgy, put forth in 1926 in *Messe und Herrenmahl*, is interestingly reworked by O. Cullmann, *Essays on the Lord's Supper* (London, 1952), a pointer toward the variety of roots for which we must look.

20 *Early Christian Worship* (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 10; London, 1953), 29 ff., 118.

21 Cf. E. Lohse, "Wort und Sakrament im Johannesevangelium," *New Testament Studies* 7, 2 (January, 1961), 110-125, who contests Cullmann's discovery of the sacraments at so many points in John and concludes that John places the Word over the sacrament because it alone gives meaning to the ritual action; the Word proclaimed in the sacrament is what provides the answer of faith (p. 125). As over against some of the extreme claims, cf. the balanced survey by B. Reicke, "Some Reflections on Worship in the New Testament," in *New Testament Essays* (T. W. Manson *Festschrift*, Manchester, 1959), 194-209.

22 Cf. Reicke, *op. cit.*, 206, and especially I Cor. 14:23 ff.

why the Lord's Supper just by itself does not always accomplish this.

Imagine a lad who loves a humble maid. He woos her with all his art, pouring forth his love, and she responds, in a simple, maidenly way. But for some strange reason she never can bring herself to say the simple words, "I love you," though in her heart she knows she does. And so the young man redoubles his efforts, and she yields herself to him in all proper, maidenly ways, without, however, ever saying the plain words he longs to hear, "I love you." At last there comes a time when, lacking the plain words from her lips, he begins to doubt her actions. "If she gives herself to me thus in love, perhaps she yields to others too," he begins to think; doubt gnaws at his heart, and all her actions and response, intended to convince him of her love, simply increase his doubts, because he does not hear that simple declaration that would place all her actions in the right context.

Something similar can happen, I suggest, in the sacrament unexplained by clear preaching. It did happen in the medieval world. What is intended to convey God's love and forgiveness so personally can be misunderstood without plain gospel words. Someone will say, "But liturgy makes it clear," and that is what it is intended to do, but it does not always. In England I was often tempted to ask twenty communicants or so around the altar in a Cambridge church what the eucharist meant to them. I did get some reflection of ideas from students, townspeople, and even theologians, and the variety of views was appalling, from humanist to Roman Catholic! Liturgy alone did not make the action clear. If our view of the Word is not clear, understanding of the sacraments will be muddled too. In this whole area current biblical study has a great deal to offer. Witness the recent report by a German commission on the Lord's Supper, surprising agreement on the biblical witness about it, by Lutheran and Reformed and Union theologians;[23] and, too, the progress in South India interconfessionally on the Lord's Supper.[24] Such things are possible when we are willing to go back behind entrenched positions to the biblical foundations—which, according to our Lutheran view, is always where we should begin.

23 Cf. E. M. Skibbe, "Discussion of Intercommunion in German Protestantism," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, XI 2 (May, 1959), 91-111.

24 Cf. *Lutheran World* II, 1 (June, 1955), 74 ff., and III, 2 (September, 1956), 178 ff.

III

A third area to be noted where we ought to wrestle with contemporary biblical theology involves Law and Gospel, a contrast Luther pressed.[25] God has given us his Word in these two forms, Law and Gospel, and the art of rightly dividing them is what makes a Christian and a theologian. C. F. W. Walther, as we know, made more precise this is "proper distinction between Law and Gospel."[26] Sometimes, however, this distinction has been sharpened into a perversion, and the Law-Gospel antithesis may become a blinder to seeing what Scripture really means.

I once made the acquaintance, for example, of an extremely intelligent layman for whom this was a particular shibboleth. A convert to Lutheranism, and well-read theologically, he carried this distinction so far as to see the Epistle lesson that we read in church each Sunday always as law, and the Gospel pericope as gospel every time. Such a pattern seemed at first to be just one man's over-logical analysis, until I read an essay by H. E. Jacobs, stating that in the Service, "The Epistle is the Word of Christian Law," a point he felt even Luther had not understood.[27]

Such a dichotomy, however, where the Sunday epistles are conceived as Law, driving us to Christ, and the second lesson from Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John as Gospel, always bringing consolation and grace, scarcely stands up. Surely an epistle lesson like Gal. 4:1 ff., read on the First Sunday after Christmas, about how God sent forth his Son to redeem sinners is not theologically "Law." On the other hand, selections read from the Sermon on the Mount as Gospel lessons for Sundays after Trinity (6, 8, etc.) may theologically be "law," demands of God driving us to Christ, for orthodox Lutheranism has insisted the Sermon on the Mount always is Law.[28]

25 Cf., e.g., his *Commentary on Galatians*, remarks on 1:7, or the "Sermon on Law and Gospel" (St. Louis ed., 9, 802 ff.).

26 C. F. W. Walther, *The Proper Distinction between Law and Gospel* (German, 1884; Eng. tr., St. Louis, 1928).

27 *The Lutheran Movement in England* (Philadelphia, 1916), 299.

28 For this view from Lutheran orthodoxy that the Sermon on the Mount is "only Law," a mirror of our sins, as one view among many, cf. *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*,[3] 1053, or G. Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* (New York, 1960), 224 f. The view, widely found commentators (e.g. M. Loy, *The Sermon on the Mount* (Columbus, 1909), 10 ff.), is also

On this whole Law-Gospel antithesis, current Bible analysis ha something to say to us Lutherans: first, that the terms we usuall translate "law" in the Old Testament (*torah,* for example) actuall have a far wider range of meaning. *Torah* means at times instructio teaching, what we have come to call *didache* in the New Testament *torah* at times even means revelation and God's redemptive work i history.[29] Secondly, we must observe in the New Testament that th work usually translated "law," *nomos,* at times means "principle"—th phrase "law of Christ" ought to be so understood.[30]

C. H. Dodd has set forth a reappraisal of the whole area in a litt book, *Gospel and Law.*[31] That book, with its biblical evidence, has n received in the ten years since it appeared the attention it should hav among us.[32] Dodd poses the question whether *kerygma* and *didache* i

held by some recent biblical scholars like Gerhard Kittel ("a demand exaggerated to the poi of paradox and nonsense") and in circles beyond Lutheranism—e.g., Charles Gore, *The Sermo on the Mount* (London, 1902), 2 ff., or A. R. Vidler in *Christ's Strange Work* ("a terrifyin summons to repentance" bringing home our complete dependence on Christ). Robert Frost poem, *A Masque of Mercy,* reflects this view:

> Paul's constant theme. The Sermon on the Mount
> Is just a frame-up to insure the failure
> Of all of us, so all of us will be
> Thrown prostrate at the Mercy Seat for Mercy.

(*Complete Poems of Robert Frost,* 1949, p. 631, as quoted in H. K. McArthur, *Understandin the Sermon on the Mount* (New York, 1960), p. 17.)

Orthodoxy is, of course, right that texts from Matt. 5-7 *can* be preached as Law, b that the *logia* are "only Law" scarcely fits any real exegesis of them either for Jesus' ow lifetime or for their use in the early church; that the *didachai* of the Sermon *can* be se as Gospel is shown brilliantly, I think, by J. Jeremias' little monograph, *Die Bergpredi* (Calwer Hefte, 27; Stuttgart, 1959).

29 See the Brown-Driver-Briggs or Koehler-Baumgartner Hebrew lexicons under *toral* the term means "teaching," e.g., at Isa. 1:10, and at Ps. 78:1 refers to a summary of Heil geschichte. C. H. Dodd, who points out in his book *The Bible and the Greeks* (London, 1935 25-41, how the Septuagint rendering of *torah* by the Greek *nomos* caused a more legalist connotation, at times of "law code," writes that, for the Old Testament, *torah* "is in its broade sense the revelation of God, his nature and character, his purpose and his mighty works" (p. 33

30 Cf. AGB, *op. cit., s.v. nomos,* pp. 544 f., sections 2 and 5. Note Rom. 3:27, 7:23, 25, 8: Gal. 6:2.

31 *Gospel and Law, The Relation of Faith and Ethics in Early Christianity* (New Yor 1951). Note also his essay "ENNOMOS CHRISTOU," in *Studia Paulina in honorem Johann de Zwaan septuagenarii* (Haarlem, 1953), 96-110.

32 The only review which I have found by an American Lutheran is a quite positive o by R. D. Snyder in *The Lutheran Quarterly* IV, 4 (Nov., 1952), 458 f. The review in *The logische Literaturzeitung* 77, 10 (Oct., 1952), 614 f., by J. Jeremias comments favorably on th study of early Christian faith and ethics and suggests that the two are closer together tha even Dodd has assumed. A German translation has now appeared, *Das Gesetz der Freih* (Munich, 1960).

he New Testament are simply to be identified with the traditional heological categories of Gospel and Law, or whether, on the basis of he scripture passages *didache* must not be considered something far nore positive, following in the wake of the Gospel.[33] New Testament eaching, *didache,* is in this view not, theologically speaking, just Law. Addressed to the man in Christ, who is sinner yet *justus,* it is a call o have the mind of Christ and a spelling out of how, under the Spirit, his occurs in certain specimen areas. I cannot convince myself that Rom. 12:1 ff. is just a rehash of 1:18-3:20. Rather Paul writes his thical sections, not to convict all men of sin again, but, more positively, o address the justified man in Christ about living out his faith. eremias refers to this as *gelebter Glaube* and suggests how the precepts f the Sermon on the Mount, viewed with all the rigors of current New Testament analysis, can emerge as Gospel, not merely as Law.[34]

Law and Gospel, precious as our Lutheran heritage here is, must ot blind us to the Scriptures themselves. And perhaps the Scriptures elp us better to understand our heritage.

IV

Last of all, the touchy ground of inspiration. Most of us reject he later theories of verbal inspiration, binding the Bible so, more Aristotelian often than the doctrine of transubstantiation. But it seems o me wrong, because of such perversions, for us to avoid all discussions bout the Spirit's role in Scripture or to refuse to say something more ositive.

Current scholarship should alert us to at least two important oints. First, a distinction between Greek and Hebraic views of inspiraion. The Hellenistic notion was of an inspired book; words were

33 Dodd's distinction holds, I think, between *kerygma* and *didache* as a "rule of thumb," ven though one may not want to dot all his "i's" or cross all "t's." The recent reexamination an Aberdeen thesis by R. H. Mounce, *The Essential Nature of New Testament Preaching* Grand Rapids, 1960), endorses much of Dodd and also agrees with Jeremias that *kerygma* nd *didache* are much closer that Dodd's pioneer analysis made them. Jeremias is doubtless orrect that *didache* included "constant rehearsal of the contents of the *kerygma*" (*Die Bergredigt, op. cit.,* p. 18). Dodd himself had allowed that *didache* was more than just "ethical inruction"; cf. *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments* (London, 1936), p. 7. H. G. Wood, in an article in *New Testament Essays, op. cit.,* 306 ff., suggests that Gospel should be egarded as composed of *kerygma* and *didache.*

34 *Op. cit.,* p. 29.

divinely fixed, and anyone could go to this almost "magical" book and unlock their meaning. Generally this has become our view. Contrasted to this was the Judaistic one which sees the Spirit active at this end, with the interpreter, as well as at the other end, in the writer's day. Here one looks for the Spirit active in the community and its interpreters.[35] This latter view is closer, I suggest, to Calvin's emphasis on the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit and Luther's idea that the exegete must first grasp the Gospel, which is an understanding given only by the Spirit.

The other point arises out of Form Criticism, that discipline which teaches us that most of our stories about Jesus circulated orally for twenty years or so, passed on from devout mouth to mouth, before the evangelists wrote them down. Such a view makes it clear that it will not do, in defining inspiration, to limit it to the four evangelists. We must see the Spirit at work in the dozens of nameless witnesses who transmitted words and stories which Luke, for example, later wrote down.

It has been objected against Bultmann's form critical analysis that he thus canonizes the whole Palestinian church![36] He gives the entire Christian community a hand in transmitting Jesus' words. All these Christians must therefore be fitted in under the Spirit's influence. And that, I suggest, was so. If you had asked these early Christians, they would boldly have claimed they did have the Spirit, and witnessed to Jesus under the aegis of the Holy Spirit. What we talk about so theoretically under "inspiration" was to these people most real. And so, it seems to me, we ought to try to say something more positive, and better, about the Spirit and the Scriptures, as contemporary insights suggest.

Word—and sacraments—Law and Gospel—inspiration. Surely these are key areas where biblical study today has something to say.

35 For a brief survey, cf. R. Abba, *The Nature and Authority of the Bible* (Philadelphia, 1958), 102 ff. The agreement of the New Testament with Jewish rather than Greek philosophical views at this point is suggested in J. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Assen, 1954). Affinity between the New Testament and Qumran in stressing the inspiration of the interpreter as well as the original writer is presented by F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids, 1959). On the whole problem, cf. Smart, *op. cit.*, especially 179 ff.

36 B. S. Easton, *The Gospel Before the Gospels* (New York, 1928), p. 118.

No retreat from the Word, but working under it, we attempt to put in words the scriptural truths. The central theme must be the God who speaks and acts ("Word of God," as we sum it up). He speaks and acts, among other places, in sacraments. Here we need to restress Baptism and rethink the Lord's Supper under the Word, and preach more clearly so that people more fully understand. Shibboleths like Law and Gospel need to be retested scripturally, and we need a more positive appreciation of the Spirit's role, in Scripture and elsewhere—unless we are to leave God's life-giving activity today to the Pentecostal sects. In all these areas current biblical scholarship offers pointers for the task of constantly maintaining a theology and life under the Word of God.

A Study of Contemporary Lutheran Preaching

By William Backus

TO WHAT extent do the sermons of contemporary American Lutheran pastors reflect the content of the apostolic *kerygma?* To find a partial answer to this question, I compared the content of the preaching of the apostles recorded in the New Testament with the content of 206 Lutheran sermons printed during the years 1930 to 1950. These sermons for Sundays of the church year were selected at random and may be supposed to furnish a fair representation of the content of Lutheran preaching during these two decades.

Elements in Apostolic Preaching

As criteria for judging the sermons in the study, I selected the elements of the New Testament *kerygma.* Clearly, the apostles thought of themselves as preachers of a single message: that in Christ's life, death, and resurrection God had done something about human sin. If contemporary preaching is to claim affinity with that of the New Testament, it must concern itself, not merely with explaining doctrines, or discoursing on stewardship, but with this action of God in Christ. Other preaching material might be true, interesting, provocative, and even relevant, but it is not the proclamation of the apostles. Nor are the samples of apostolic preaching available to us restricted to the sermons in Acts. The Epistles, the Gospels, and the apostles' summaries of their own preaching have one theme: God's deed of redemption in Jesus Christ.[1]

The apostolic message evidently had a consistently similar outline. St. Paul preserves a tabloid summary of this outline in I Cor. 15:1 ff., calling it "the gospel which I preached unto you." Here is his own condensation of the proclamation: "That Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures. . . ." The sermons of Acts, the

1 Cf. G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,* s.v. *Kerryssoo.*

keletons of the four gospels, and even the Apostles' Creed preserve the ame outline of the primitive message. No matter how they might be rranged, three major themes are always present: (1) A claim that esus was the Messiah who fulfilled the Old Testament Scriptures (Acts 2:16; 10:43; Rom. 1:2; I Cor. 15:3-4). (2) An historical exposition of Jesus' life, death, resurrection, and exaltation (in all of which God was acting in Christ, not merely being passively appeased). (3) A summons to the hearers to repent and accept the forgiveness of sins which Jesus makes available by his work (Acts 2:38; 3:19; 10:43).[2]

These three major divisions ordinarily contain subdivisions. We have formulated eight elements of New Testament preaching which we then used as a basis for testing the Lutheran preaching of our study. C. H. Dodd's little book, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments,* was of enormous value as a guide to the elements of the New Testament proclamation. Here are the eight elements into which we analyzed the *kerygma.*

1. *God* was in Christ. The preachers of the New Testament told of a deed in which *God* was active. Preaching the utter involvement of God in the atonement eliminates portraying God as the offended Creditor exacting a price for sin which Christ offers to pay him; God sensing satisfaction as the victim dies and payment comes across the line; God as pure justice opposed to Christ as pure love; God determined to damn the world, but thwarted by Christ at the cross. "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself."

2. According to the Scriptures. From the Gospels through the sermons of Acts and all the Epistles, the work of Christ is treated as a climactic continuation of the Hebrew religion. This is because Jesus the man fulfilled the eschatological expectations set up in the Scriptures. Fulfillment is embodied in such themes as the forerunnership of John, the Davidic lineage, ministry, suffering, death, resurrection, and exaltation of Jesus the Christ, the defeat of the powers of darkness, the end of the "present evil age," the dawn of the new age, and the miracles of Jesus.

2 Archibald M. Hunter, *The Message of the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1944), p. 24.

3. Sin in the life of the hearer. The preaching of the New Testament is life-related. And the point at which it first touches the lives of the listeners is in its discussion of sin. It is this discussion which enables a relevant announcement of forgiveness. But preaching sin to believing Christians whom God has declared righteous is a more complex procedure than preaching to the unregenerate. Our models do not address Christians as men belonging to the devil, men under the wrath of God, men under the sentence of damnation. Instead, they speak to the Christian as one living a life hidden with Christ in God, but one still sensitive to the forces of the old aeon. A part of the Christian man which is, strictly speaking, his no longer, still seeks to influence his behavior and return him to the old way of life. This component is variously described as "flesh," "lusts of the flesh," "old man," "outward man." Thus the New Testament is able to deal seriously with sin in the Christian without disregarding the uniqueness of his relationship to God in Christ. It never merely presents the doctrines of original and actual sin for the sake of "review." Instead, it recognizes the acute problem of the Christian hearer with his dual nature and attempts to deal with it by the message of God condemning sin in the flesh of Jesus Christ.

4. Christ died. . . . The death of Christ on the cross is proclaimed without exception in every summary we possess of the New Testament *kerygma*. The sermons of Acts all speak of it. The Gospels devote disproportionately large amounts of narrative to the details of his passion and death. Mark gives one-fifth of his Gospel to the passion, Luke about one-sixth, and Matthew about one-seventh. The Fourth Gospel repeatedly points to the passion and death of Jesus as critical, the hour of his glorification, and the consequent judgment of this world. The entire Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of the sacrificial death of Christ, and I Peter proclaims the shedding of his blood as our ransom price. St. Paul's short summary of his gospel, I Cor. 15, asserts that Christ died. And when he reminds the Galatians of what they had heard from him he summarizes thus: "before your eyes Christ Jesus was publicly placarded as crucified."

5. . . . for our sins. Our model preachers unanimously connect the death of Christ on the cross with human sin. The sermons of Acts declare that forgiveness of sins is preached in his name. For Paul

forgiveness was essential to his gospel (I Cor. 15). Jesus himself proclaims the breaking of his body and the shedding of his blood to have happened on behalf of men (Mark 14:42 ff.). Likewise for Hebrews and the Fourth Gospel, Christ's atonement is a representative act in which he suffers for sin in the place of his people.

6. . . . and the third day he rose again. The resurrection was not just a chapter in the story. The apostles defined their task in terms of it. They claimed to be preachers of "Jesus and the resurrection" (Acts 1:22). For them the resurrection *was* the message because in it God had declared Jesus the ruler of the new age through his victorious death. For the apostles the resurrection was the event which had converted tragedy into a gospel. To preach the gospel without the resurrection would have been to shrink the story beyond recognition.

7. Spirit-directed living. The preaching of the New Testament is not pure historical narration. The risen Christ pours his Spirit into his church. His counsel determines the faith and behavior of his people. Out of this ruling presence of God in their lives the men of the kingdom learn their ethics. For Paul the Holy Spirit (or the indwelling Christ) was the source of all knowledge, faith, hope, love, and the unity of the church. He was the present guarantee of the final perfection of the resurrection life. In the Johannine writings the Spirit of Christ in men is the basis for the new nature of faith and love.

8. The Spirit in the gospel. When people hear the gospel, the Spirit comes to them to foster the life of the new age in them. Jesus taught that the word of the kingdom bears fruit in the lives of men. As the message is preached in the sermons of Acts, the Holy Ghost comes upon those listening. In his I Cor. 15 summary, Paul reminds his readers that this message will work their ultimate salvation if they continue to use it. For him the message has power to build and strengthen men in Christ, to do battle with the evil one, to cause the Spirit to come to the hearer, to accomplish a change inside men, and to combat ungodliness. It is this word which, in Hebrews, is quick and powerful. For I Peter, new birth by the Word of God produces pure souls and works love. The same message brings its hearers to spiritual adulthood. In I John the keeping of the Word causes perfection of the love of God in men.

The Insulated Gospel in America

The 206 Lutheran sermons we analyzed varied in their treatment of the eight elements of the apostolic proclamation. Sometimes the proclamation was explicit, but so effectively insulated from the listener that our New Testament models would never have recognized it as preaching. A few examples of this "insulated gospel" will illustrate:

Preaching to the damned. Preaching to people under God's judgment is comparatively simple, since their spiritual condition is unified. They have no spiritual life to complicate matters. But the sermons in our study were written to be preached to Christians. Nevertheless they frequently addressed themselves to the spiritual condition of raw unbelievers, prospects for evangelism, or hypocrites. In such preaching, exhortations to self-surrender were addressed to life-long Christians, threats of the wrath of God were employed to motivate improved behavior, and reminders of the terrible state of the damned after death were calculated to make hearers stuff their collection envelopes. Thus it happened that even in sermons where the apostolic proclamation was literally incorporated, it was frequently coupled with techniques which made the listener doubt the relevance of the message for him since the condition described was not his own. Twenty-nine of the sermons studied could have been preached with truth and relevance only to unbelievers. In eighty of the sermons studied the discussion of sin described a condition possible only in the non-Christian. And in many of the sermons, sin was omitted entirely as the point at which the gospel might press into the worshiper's life.

The sermon-centered sermon. In sixty-five instances the sermons were so preoccupied with their own contents that they neglected the hearers altogether. For example, in one of these "sermon-centered sermons" the preacher described at length John the Baptist's application of forgiveness to the sins of his hearers long ago, and totally omitted the application of forgiveness to the sins of the people to whom the sermon was addressed! Some employed themselves exclusively with the exposition of the text, the use of vivid illustration, or the expounding of a particular dogma. The resulting neglect of the worshiper who was supposed to be listening impaired the message itself

nd ignored a fundamental characteristic of New Testament preaching, namely, a concern for the hearer.

Spraying on the Word. In sixty-two sermons there was such an pparent lack of clearly defined objectives for the listeners that it would ave been virtually miraculous had they carried away any unified impression of the gospel. Instead of aiming at a particular objective, the preacher just sprayed his message at the audience in a profusion of oosely tied exhortations. The following goals for the listener all occurred in a single sermon on the story of Jesus' circumcision: The earer should (1) resolve to defend the doctrine of infant Baptism, (2) feel secure in the knowledge that Jesus' name has divine origin, (3) set up in his home obedience to the will of God, (4) seek security n the meaning of the name Jesus, (5) take stock of himself this New ear; (6) distinguish his conduct by gratitude to Jesus, (7) defend esus' name when it is attacked, (8) worship Jesus by going to church, nd (9) pray for the Holy Ghost and for self-surrender. Admittedly his sermon is an extreme case, but it illustrates how a multiplication of disparate goals frequently deprived the hearer of any help from the preaching and set up in his mind the impression that the preacher had o "reach" for applications.

Sunday morning Dogmatics. The sermons analyzed showed the stamp of technical dogmatics all too clearly. That is, they frequently presented segments of a crafted theological system lifted bodily out of the whole. Thus the preaching became, not the offering of Christ o people, but a Sunday morning systematics lecture. Two sermons were merely learned discussions of the proper use of law and gospel with no relation whatever to the listener. Time-honored assumptions were sometimes stated as if they were the faith once revealed to the saints—for example, "There are hypocrites in every congregation." Sometimes the aim of the sermon was simply to get the hearer to agree to doctrinal theses—let us say, that the pope is the Antichrist. The aim of a sermon on "The Rich Man and Lazarus" was to gain assent to the following theses: (1) There is no purgatory and no dormant state of the soul after death, (2) the soul passes to heaven or hell immediately at death, (3) all Scripture is to be used for getting o heaven, since the entire Bible is the means of salvation (with no reference to Christ's atonement). Note the dogmatic form of this

analysis of righteousness: "In this kingdom, righteousness is preached. a) objective righteousness procured for us by Jesus through His active and passive obedience, b) subjective righteousness that 'we as the children of God lead a holy life according to' the Word of God. In this kingdom this objective righteousness is appropriated by faith, and subjective righteousness is the object of conscious striving."

Taking the cross for granted. Here is a trend most difficult to explain in view of the Lutheran preaching tradition. The proclamation of the death of Christ has always been regarded as an indispensable element in any sermon. Yet our sample showed a marked reluctance to devote space or effort to the proclamation of atonement through Christ's death. This gave rise to a singular sameness in expressing the atonement. Most often it was described with familiar metaphors recurring again and again. Often the one- or two-line statement of the atonement was quite obviously no more than a genuflection to the homiletical tradition that you must "include the gospel in every sermon." Of course, many sermons did not discuss the death of Christ in connection with the hearer's sins at all. But even where a reference to it was included, in forty-three sermons it was no more than the repetition of an overworked phrase. "Not with gold or silver but with his holy, precious blood and with his innocent suffering and death" (in fifteen sermons). "Sins washed away in the blood of the Lamb," "The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," "justification by faith," "fulfilled the Law for you." The predominant emphasis in the discussion of the atonement was on the blood metaphor. Commonly preachers seemed deliberately to avoid direct discussion of the atonement by merely quoting one or more Bible passages describing it without further development.

Do We Preach Christ Crucified?

How did the preaching in our study succeed in employing the elements of the *kerygma* which the New Testament preachers considered as essential to their message? Here are the eight elements of the New Testament message discussed in the first part of this article and the frequency of their occurrence in the preaching studied:

1. *The work of Christ is one in which God participates.* Only 30

per cent, or 61 of the sermons, even alluded to the atonement as *God's* action. Some of the remaining 145 sermons favored the description of God as the offended Creditor exacting his price for sin and feeling appeased by the death of Jesus, the innocent victim.

2. *The person and work of Jesus fulfill the Scriptures.* In spite of the fact that the Advent and Christmas seasons, as well as the Epiphany cycle of lessons, offer countless opportunities for discussion of the element of fulfillment in Christ as Messiah, only 41 of the sermons (19 per cent) seized upon the fulfillment theme as the New Testament preachers invariably did. Occasionally the fulfillment of prophecy was invoked to prove the inerrancy of the Scriptures. This inference did not occur to the apostolic preachers.

3. *Sin in the life of the worshiper.* The worshiper's sin is essential to the integrity of the New Testament message. It is the sin of man and its consequences with which Christ came to deal. Yet 55 per cent (113) of the sermons studied had no discussion of sin related to the lives of the listeners. Many others merely cited immoral acts without tracing their relationship to the alien forces in the listener which the New Testament describes as the flesh, the old man, the carnal mind, etc. Sometimes the preacher discussed at length the former sins of the hearer, the condition of the hearer before Baptism, content to assume that he was thus "preaching the Law." Still others simply discussed the sins of the Pharisee in the text, the Jews at our Lord's time, Peter at the denial, or the unbelievers not attending church today.

4. *Christ died on the cross.* As we have pointed out, the death of Christ on the cross is one of the indispensable elements in the New Testament *kerygma.* The space the Gospels devote to the proclamation of his passion and death, the centrality of the cross in the sermons of Acts, the repeated reference to it in the epistles, witness to the apostolic conviction that the story they had to tell always involved the crucified Lord. It is unnecessary to demonstrate the emphasis Lutheran preaching has traditionally assigned to the crucifixion. Nevertheless in the sermons of our analysis, only about half proclaimed it in any relation at all to the hearer. Forty-nine per cent (100 sermons) mentioned the death of Christ in connection with the hearer's sins, and many of these employed the overworked phrases we have previously discussed. It even happened that an occasional sermon on forgiveness and faith omitted

any discussion of the death of Christ! Another sermon mentioned the event, but only in connection with a warning to avoid false prophets (to be identified by their failure to preach the death of Christ!). Not uncommonly the cross was simply listed as one of the elements witnessing Christians should include in their message to the world. Even when the death of Christ was preached to the listener's sins, the amount of attention devoted to it was infinitesimal compared with that which it receives in the New Testament.

5. *Christ's death was for men's sin.* Only 48 per cent, a total of 99 of the sermons studied, proclaimed this element. Where sin in the hearer was not discussed, there was naturally a corresponding tendency to omit forgiveness. Sometimes the dogma of the active obedience of Christ was employed in such a way as to short-circuit any discussion of forgiveness. For example: "The Son of God, in His twelfth year as a human being and the world's substitute, obeyed Mary and Joseph as His human parents. He obeyed as a part of His great Messianic mission. He obeyed in our stead and for our sakes. He perfectly fulfilled the Fourth Commandment in our place." This use of the active obedience of Christ is foreign to the New Testament. The Lutheran dogmaticians of the seventeenth century never separated the active and passive obedience of Christ. This highly metaphorical use of the active obedience in preaching makes possible the bypassing of the cross and its significance for the hearer.

6. *Christ rose from the dead.* Of the themes never omitted from the apostolic *kerygma,* this one was most consistently ignored in our sample. Only 35 out of all 206 sermons, a bare 17 per cent, included even so much as an allusion to the resurrection of Christ. One sermon on the resurrection of believers failed to speak of our Lord's triumph over the grave. Since the earliest Christian preachers thought of themselves as heralds of the resurrection, this might be the most dramatic of all the signs that the preaching of our study does not conform to an apostolic model.

7. *New life through the Spirit's presence.* Only 28 per cent, 57 of the sermons, suggested the slightest connection between the behavior urged on the hearer and the Holy Spirit, or the indwelling Christ. Do this because you ought to, follow Christ's example, note God's will,

do good for the joy of it, beware of the penalties of hell—these were common substitutes for the Spirit's power as the source of sanctification.

8. *The gospel and sacraments as means of grace.* If anything is distinctive in Lutheran theology it is the doctrine of the means of grace. Yet a bare 29 per cent, 59 sermons, related the achievement of behavior goals in the sermon to the death of Christ, to the gospel, or to the sacraments. Rewards were promised, punishments threatened, natural reactions of gratitude were invoked as motivation. Prayer and willpower were most frequently recommended as ways to achieve the behavior goals of the sermon.

If our sample sermons are representative of Lutheran preaching in America during the two decades in which they were written, we can now draw inferences about what the average Lutheran Christian might hear each year as he worships in church. For about seven Sundays each year he listens to sermons fitted to the spiritual needs of unbelievers. For twenty Sundays he hears the Law addressed to him, but describing a situation of total damnation, a condition not his own since he is a man in Christ. Sixteen Sundays the sermons he hears have a profusion of loosely-related aims and may leave him with little clear impression of the gospel. Ten Sundays each year not a single element of the apostolic *kerygma* occurs in the sermons. On nineteen Sundays he hears one element only; twenty-nine or thirty Sundays bring two or fewer. He waits forty-two Sundays to hear a sermon containing as many elements of the gospel as St. Paul's little summary in I Cor. 15. That includes five basic assertions of the *kerygma*. Our average listener has not heard a sermon containing all eight elements of the *kerygma* together for about four years!

Fifteen Sundays a year the preacher sets forth the work of Christ as a task in which God is involved. The fulfillment motif occurs only ten Sundays in fifty-two. The death of Christ for the forgiveness of sins is proclaimed to our average hearer twenty-six Sundays each year. He hears reference made to real shortcomings and sin in himself twenty-four Sundays in a year. The Holy Spirit as the source of new life, and the gospel and sacraments as God's means for nourishing that life, are recommended to him fifteen Sundays yearly. Presumably his preacher knows how integral the resurrection was to the message of the apostles,

yet he proclaims that event only eight or nine Sundays a year, mostly, of course, in the Easter season.

No one proposes that the eight elements of the *kerygma* must occur in every sermon, nor that some variations might not occur in summaries of the *kerygma*. But the three great themes of the apostolic proclamation might reasonably be expected to form the foundation of any preaching program aiming for affinity to that proclamation. Here is how the sermons of our sample utilized these themes: (1) *Fulfillment*: Invariably present in the New Testament models. In our mythical average hearer's church, ten Sundays each year. (2) *Historical events*: The death and resurrection of Christ were indispensable to the New Testament preaching. In sermons sampled, they occur as a complete unit only nine Sundays a year. (3) *For our sins*: That Christ's death provided forgiveness or help for man was always a part of the primitive proclamation. In the sermons studied it occurred only twenty-five Sundays a year.

The gospel is a unified story. No one can specify which of its "elements" are absolutely indispensable and which might be omitted without impairing the power of the Word. It would not be reasonable or in accord with the preaching of the New Testament to insist that every element be articulated in every sermon. Some of the elements were always preached. Others were probably always included in the message even though the summaries we possess only note them briefly. Thus, when the message was delivered by apostolic preachers, it was proclaimed as a whole. They did not fragmentize it into "doctrines" or "topics." To attempt to present it outside the context of the hearers' needs would have made no sense to them. The contemporary preaching of our sample has all but omitted certain essential elements in the story, and often has recited its message without reference to the hearer. The reader should take care not to conclude that all the sermons in the study were forgetful of the *kerygma*. Among many of the preachers there was evidence of a healthy sensitivity to the great apostolic proclamation. But much of the preaching examined in this study, whatever its merits, cannot claim close identification with the message of the New Testament.

The Arnoldshain Theses on the Lord's Supper in Recent Discussion

By Egil Grislis

IN GERMANY as well as in this country, renewed attention has been devoted to the interpretation of the Lord's Supper. An especially noteworthy development has been the formulation of the Arnoldshain Theses,[1] completed in 1957 by a Committee of Lutheran, Reformed, and Union theologians of the Evangelical Church of Germany.[2]

Since their publication, the theses have elicited very vigorous response—enthusiastic approval as well as thoughtful criticism. Often accessible only with difficulties in various periodicals, the more significant statements have now been collected by Gottfried Niemeier in a volume entitled *Lehrgespräch über das Heilige Abendmahl*.[3]

Although the discussion is by no means concluded and new pronouncements appear almost daily, several very significant statements have already emerged. It is the purpose of this article to provide an objective account of this discussion in the belief that it contains creative insights of such importance that no Lutheran should bypass them. Of course, at present there is no unanimity among the interpreters. They disagree among themselves not only about what the theses actually say, but also about what Lutherans ought to believe. Yet precisely such a situation is a good indication that new ground is being broken not for the sake of fruitless academic debate, but in order to equip the pastors of the church with a relevant, yet still Lutheran, interpretation of the Gospel.

The following presentation has been organized as a three-step commentary on each of the eight Arnoldshain theses. The first step contains the basic points from the official commentary on the theses, written by Professor H. Gollwitzer.[4]

1 Eugene M. Skibbe, "Discussion of Intercommunion in German Protestantism," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, XI (1959), pp. 91-111; Paul M. Bretscher, "The Arnoldshain Theses on the Lord's Supper," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, XXX (1959), pp. 83-91.

2 *Zur Lehre vom Heiligen Abendmahl.* Bericht über das Abendmahlsgespräch der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland 1947-1957 und Erläuterungen seines Ergebnisses in Gemeinschaft mit H. Gollwitzer, W. Kreck und H. Meyer erstattet von G. Niemeier. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961, 5th edition. From here on referred to as *Zur Lehre.* As members of the committee are listed (pp. 18 and 19): E. Bizer, G. Bornkamm, P. Brunner, F. Delekat, H. Gollwitzer, H. Iwand, J. Jeremias, E. Käsemann, W. Kreck, K. G. Kuhn, W. von Löwenich, H. Meyer, E. Michel, W. Niesel, E. Schlink, E. Schweitzer, H. Vogel, O. Weber, E. Wolf.

3 München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961. From here on referred to as *Lehrgespräch.*

4 "Bericht über die von der Abendmahlskommission erarbeitete Erklärung" *Zur Lehre*, pp. 19-34.

The second step presents the interpretation by Professor Peter Brunner,[5] very significant as a serious attempt to show that the theses are compatible with traditional Lutheran theology. It must be noted, however, that although Brunner's interpretation is possible, most other interpreters have not accepted it as doing full justice to the real intent of the theses. Finally, we have introduced such other interpreters whose comments elucidate either the major ideas of the theses or the important problems which are thereby raised.

The text of the theses given here is the English translation provided by the Evangelical Church in Germany.[6] Its obvious advantage is the faithful, almost literal, and yet still readable rendering of the German text.[7]

What do we, as members of the one apostolic church, understand as the decisive content of the biblical witness with respect to the Lord's Supper?

Gollwitzer: Having been intentionally put forth as a question, the heading indicates that the following theses are not intended as a summary of the history of eucharistic doctrine. The theses are rather an inquiry concerning the beliefs of the undersigned theologians as members of the Christian church. The church is not thereby merely instructed, but also invited to respond together with the theologians. The reference to "the one apostolic church" is meant to indicate that the authors are not partisans of any one given tradition, but engaged in a dialogue concerning that one, holy, and apostolic church which is normative for all Christians.[8] This means that the theses will follow the heritage of the Reformation only in so far as it is in agreement with the apostolic witness. The phrase "the biblical witness with respect to the Lord's Supper" expresses the belief that the various New Testament eucharistic texts do provide a harmonious apostolic witness—not a single doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but nevertheless one witness. Finally, an inquiry is made concerning "the decisive content," thus spelling out the criterion for dealing with the differences encountered both in the New Testament itself and among the traditional denominational positions.[9]

Brunner: Underlining the didactic and kerygmatic character of the theses, Brunner strongly cautions against an out-of-context concern with the individual theses. The theses are understood properly only when viewed as mutually elucidating parts of one whole.[10] This insight enables Brunner to affirm the Lutheran character of the theses, and hence is decisive for a proper appreciation of Brunner's position.

5 "Die dogmatische und kirchliche Bedeutung des Ertrages des Abendmahlsgesprächs," *Lehrgespräch,* pp. 104-127, previously published in *Evangelische Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* XII, 18, 1958, pp. 295-302.

6 *Lehregespräch,* pp. 332-334, and cf. Hermann Werner, "Die Arnoldshainer Abendmahlsthesen auf Englisch," *Evangelische Lutherische Kirchenzeitung,* X, 1959.

7 Changes have been made in punctuation and capitalization in only a few places.

8 *Zur Lehre,* p. 22.

9 *Ibid.,* p. 23.

10 *Lehrgespräch,* p. 105.

Others: The reference to "the one apostolic church" has been both sharply criticized as well as eloquently defended. Hermann Sasse sees it as "an un-Lutheran doctrine of the church,"[11] apparently suggesting that in the Una Sancta the various denominations complement each other. Georg Hoffmann voices his suspicion that the use of this phrase is more superficial than profound, overlooking the fact that on this earth every church has a denominational structure (*konfessionelle Gestalt*).[12] Gerhard Heintze, however, points out in defense of the expression that it does not suggest a disregard for the denominational structure of the church. The "apostolic church" is not viewed as if it were another organization. Rather, the authors of the theses have recognized that the three participating denominations do not possess exclusively in their own traditions the necessary resources that are needed in order to translate into contemporary terminology the traditional teachings about the Lord's Supper. Therefore they have turned to the Scriptures, not denying the fact of denominational differences, but nevertheless listening primarily to the one shepherd who speaks to the "one apostolic church."[13] Or, as H. Meyer puts it, speaking about the work of the committee, of which he was a member, "We have consciously and intentionally raised questions and worked as *members of the one,* holy, apostolic, Christian *church,* i.e. from the unity which is already granted to us in Christ through the Holy Spirit."[14]

Various concerns have also been voiced about the distinction between doctrine and witness. Some have defended it as necessary—for example, H. Meyer,[15] Wilhelm Andersen,[16] and Albert Haas.[17] Yet the distinction has not been unanimously accepted. Notably, Hermann Sasse recognizes it as a Barthian idea, already utilized at Barmen as well as elsewhere in the contemporary ecumenical movement. There, says Sasse, a confession of faith is wrongly understood to be "a relative expression of truth," and hence "the confessions of the various denominations" are viewed "not as mutually exclusive and contradictory, but as mutually complementing human attempts to express the truth of revelation. The normative power of the confession is therefore only relative."[18] Johannes Meister fears that the Arnoldshain Theses have equated "old" exegesis with "old" confessions.[19] He reminds us that church confessions are normative not because they are human pronouncements but because they proclaim the normative Word of God. Meister feels that the bypassing of past confessions sets a serious question mark over all

11 *Ibid.,* 300.
12 *Ibid.,* p. 175.
13 *Ibid.,* p. 157, cf. p. 49.
14 *Zur Lehre,* p. 35, cf. p. 42.
15 *Ibid.,* p. 35
16 *Lehrgespräch,* pp. 95, 96.
17 Albert Haas, *Die Abendmahlsgemeinschaft in der EKD* (Theologische Existenz Heute, Neue Folge Nr. 81), München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1960. The entire 97-page statement is an elaboration and mainly a defense of Gollwitzer's commentary.
18 *Lehrgespräch,* p. 297.
19 *Ibid.,* p. 254.

present formulations as well. After all, if the church can never speak normatively then the only norm remains the verbatim text of the Scriptures![20] And Georg Hoffmann voices the conviction which obviously underlies all the criticisms that are made on this point: "The underlying exegetical and hermeneutical principles are not thought through sufficiently; the difficulties are not overcome at their roots."[21]

First Thesis

1. The Lord's Supper which we celebrate is based on its having been instituted and commanded by Jesus Christ, the Lord who died for us and rose again.
2. In the Lord's Supper the exalted Lord invites his own to his table and grants them participation here and now in the future fellowship of the kingdom of God.

Gollwitzer: New Testament scholarship has not succeeded in solving the problems which surround the historicity of the institution of the Lord's Supper. For this reason Thesis 1 is unable to present a historical judgment on this issue. It only records the witness of the New Testament and does this in the certainty that through the witness of the New Testament we receive the command and the promise of the total (historical and risen) Lord.

Gollwitzer reports that as a result of the insistence by the participating New Testament scholars, the eschatological dimension was already emphasized in this first thesis. This was done in order to avoid the mistaken view that we partake of the Lord's Supper merely on the basis of a past command. In reality, if Christ is both the historical and the risen Lord, then the invitation to table fellowship is also extended now by Christ himself. As such it is a genuine continuation of the fellowship which existed during Christ's earthly lifetime, yet at the same time also an invitation to table fellowship in the kingdom of God.[22]

Brunner: Thesis 1 deals with the question of the origin of the Lord's Supper. It refers to the dying and rising Lord as the author, and places the time of institution in the period before Pentecost. Brunner admits that the refusal to locate the institution during the night of betrayal may well be a doctrinal weakness of Thesis 1. Yet Brunner also observes that such a procedure can be defended on the basis of some New Testament precedent; in John 6 we encounter a communion meal *before* the night of betrayal. In any event, even though bypassing the mention of the night of betrayal, Thesis 1 connects the institution with the events of the Passion and Easter.[23] This means, suggests Brunner, that we can speak about the presence of the exalted Lord only after Pentecost, when the church partakes of the Supper in obedience to its Lord's command, following the original institution. And in partaking of the Lord's Supper Christ gives to "his own" a "participation" "in the future fellowship of the kingdom of God." This last note, observes

20 *Ibid.*, p. 255.
21 *Ibid.*, p. 175, cf. p. 259.
22 *Zur Lehre*, p. 24.
23 *Lehrgespräch*, p. 106.

Brunner, is a helpful and yet a new emphasis in comparison with traditional Lutheran eucharistic theology.[24]

Others: The major concern of most commentators in regard to this thesis has been with the specific moment of institution. Hermann Sasse's observation,[25] made early in the discussion, that Thesis 1 is acknowledged by all churches and hence outside the realm of controversy, has been proved to be premature.[26] On the one hand, we encounter a firm insistence that the institution took place during the night in which Christ was betrayed,[27] and a critique of Thesis 1, which has departed from such an affirmation.[28] Thus, for example, the "Michaelsbruderschaft" has suggested that Thesis 1 should be clarified at this point either by stating that the Lord's Supper was instituted by Christ during the night of his betrayal or by admitting that the precise moment of institution is unknown and resting the institution upon the certainty of the Holy Spirit's guidance in the church.[29] On the other hand, even though calling the process "most painful," Gottfried Niemeier[30] admits that the explicit mention of the night of betrayal was left out at the insistence of the participating New Testament scholars. Gerhard Heintze points out that Thesis 1 does not question either the reality of the institution by the Lord or the reality of the historical life of the Lord.[31] Hence it asserts that we are dealing here with facts rather than with fiction. Nevertheless, according to Heintze,[32] Willi Marxsen, and Hans Grass, it is now recognized in modern scholarship that the New Testament record of the institution is primarily a record of the Lord's Supper which the church celebrated. There is no way of immediately and infallibly reaching back to the precise historical moment of institution.[33] Hence Thesis 1 has utilized the only proper approach when it has affirmed the institution, yet at the same time has not attempted to determine more precisely the "when, where, and how."[34]

According to the "Michaelsbruderschaft," the eschatological note of Thesis 1:2 (and 3:4) marks an advance over traditional Lutheran doctrine.[35] While not rejecting the validity of this eschatological approach, Ernst Sommerlath sees the need to affirm more strongly the bodily presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. Believing that eschatology means at least the partial presence of the new age, Sommerlath insists that the Lord's Supper actually anticipates the bodily return

24 *Ibid.*, pp. 106, 107.
25 *Ibid.*, p. 300.
26 Albert Haas, *op. cit.* p. 69.
27 *Lehrgespräch,* pp. 49, 50, cf. p. 128, ftn. 3; p. 129, ftn. 4.
28 *Ibid.*, pp. 50, 30.
29 *Ibid.*, pp. 50, 51.
30 *Ibid.*, p. 289.
31 *Ibid.*, p. 158.
32 *Ibid.*, pp. 157, 158.
33 *Ibid.*, pp. 60, 61.
34 *Ibid.*, p. 129, ftn. 4.
35 *Ibid.*, p. 50.

of Christ, even though Christ is at the moment still hidden under the eucharistic elements.[36]

Second Thesis

1. In the Lord's Supper Jesus Christ himself acts, under what the church does, as the Lord who is present in the Holy Spirit through his Word.
2. Like preaching, baptism, and the special pronouncement of the forgiveness of sins, the Lord's Supper is one of the ways in which Christ bestows upon us the gifts of the saving gospel.

Gollwitzer observed that in their writings E. Bizer and H. Grass have rightly identified the varying interpretations of the relationship between the Word and the Spirit as the real cause for the sixteenth century controversies among Protestants.[37] Yet today Thesis 2:1 is affirmed by both Lutheran and Reformed theologians. Gollwitzer records his belief that this is a great advance over past difficulties and at the same time a departure from the traditional Lutheran and Reformed positions.

Thesis 2:2 affirms that the gift is the very same in all the means of grace—this in agreement with Luther himself, but in opposition to followers of Luther who have diverged from him. The *proprium,* the uniqueness, is not attributed to the gift itself but to the manner in which the gift is received. This same insight is also brought out in reference to absolution. Since the very term "absolution" has not been acceptable to the Reformed, Thesis 2:2 substitutes for it "the special pronouncement of the forgiveness of sins." What is meant is that the "pronouncement" does not give, as it were, a more potent forgiveness, but speaks of the "special" occasion in regard to the given individual.[38]

Brunner: Thesis 2 views the Lord's Supper as a means of grace together with preaching, baptism, and absolution. The traditional affirmation of the real presence is as yet not emphasized, since this thesis concerns itself with what Brunner variously calls "liturgical" or "ecclesiastical" presence of Christ (*"gottesdienstliche" Gegenwart, Ekklesia-Gegenwart*). In Brunner's view, this more general presence is not limited to the worship service, yet is definitely indispensable for the same. That is, it is in the midst of the ecclesiastical presence of Christ that, through consecration, the real presence may be said to begin. Brunner describes this as follows. The already "ecclesiastically" present Lord accomplishes that which the pastor does.[39] Through the words of institution Christ blesses the bread and wine, and gives his body and blood as the pastor distributes bread and wine[40]—just as in baptism the "ecclesiastically" present Christ himself baptizes through the baptismal actions performed by men.

This ecclesiastical presence of Christ is defined further by identifying it with

36 *Ibid.,* pp. 88, 89.
37 *Zur Lehre,* pp. 24, 25.
38 *Ibid.,* p. 25.
39 *Lehrgespräch,* p. 107.
40 *Ibid.,* pp. 107, 108.

he presence of the Holy Spirit. Brunner gives assurance that such an identification loes not result in a spiritualism which would bypass the incarnation and a continuous christocentric concern. Brunner believes that Thesis 2 contains two safeguards against spiritualism. On the one hand, in agreement with Article V of the Augsburg Confession, "the spiritual and ecclesiastical presence of the Lord is inequivocally bound to the *verbum externum*." As Thesis 2 formulates it, "the Lord who is present in the Holy Spirit, through his Word." On the other hand, he ecclesiastical presence of Christ, when it is thus identified with the presence of the Holy Spirit, is in no way meant as a substitute for the real presence of Christ. The real presence is specifically dealt with in Thesis 4.[41] Indeed, admits Brunner, if such a later concern with the real presence were lacking, then Thesis 2 might appear to have destroyed the uniqueness of the real presence by placing it alongside preaching, baptism, and absolution. But now, insists Brunner, this is not at all the case.[42]

Others: The views of a very careful interpreter, Hans Grass, are characteristic and most likely correct. He endorses Gollwitzer's commentary in preference to Brunner's statement.[43] But this is not to suggest that recognition of the objectivity of Gollwitzer's commentary always means agreement with it. Thus Ernst Sommerlath objects to the overemphasis which is placed on the work of the Holy Spirit, an approach that for Sommerlath has the appearance of an exclusion of the equally necessary concern with the bodily presence of Christ.[44] In Gollwitzer's defense, Will Marxsen[45] insists that according to the New Testament all the means of grace bestow on the partakers one and the same gift. It is likewise to be noted, says Marxsen, that in the New Testament the Lord's Supper is mentioned comparatively seldom and does not possess a qualitatively higher significance. And in the New Testament the unity of the various *diakoniai* is found in the Holy Spirit. Identifying the Holy Spirit with the present Christ, Marxsen describes him as both the author and the content of all the means of grace. Such is the biblical perspective, and this is also taught in Thesis 2;

Third Thesis

1. The Lord's Supper is an act of worship by the congregation assembled in the name of Jesus.
2. In Communion, the Supper is indissolubly bound up with the proclamation of the saving death of Jesus which takes place by means of the oral word.
3. Accompanied by prayer, thanksgiving, and praise, bread and wine are taken, the Lord's words of institution are pronounced, and the bread and wine are distributed to the congregation to be eaten and drunk.
4. In the Lord's Supper we commemorate the death of Christ, through which God has reconciled the world to himself once and for all; in it we confess the presence of the risen

41 *Ibid.*, p. 108.
42 *Ibid.*, pp. 108, 109.
43 *Ibid.*, pp. 131, 132.
44 *Ibid.*, p. 80, cf. 23, 31.
45 *Ibid.*, p. 62.

Lord in our midst and joyfully await his return, as those called unto glory in the final consummation.

Gollwitzer views Thesis 3 in a twofold perspective as a description of what is done in the Lord's Supper and as the outline of the essential components of the Lord's Supper. In reference to Thesis 3:1, Gollwitzer observes that the Lord's Supper is essentially given to the congregation for the use of the congregation. The Lord's Supper is not an individual feast! Such a statement, however, does not necessarily reject communion for the sick or at a wedding.[46] Rather, 3:1 only emphasizes the need to make absolutely clear that the Lord's Supper is not merely a private communion of the individual with God, or something that concerns only one family. Instead, the Lord's Supper must be understood as an action and a gathering of the entire congregation of which individuals are members.[47]

According to 3:2 in Gollwitzer's interpretation, the sermon belongs to the essence of the Lord's Supper. The death of Christ which we are enjoined to proclaim according to I Cor. 11:26 is not fully proclaimed without the Word. Therefore the Roman Catholic Mass which is celebrated without a sermon (*Stillmesse*) is rejected as well as such an exclusive concern with liturgy as suggests that merely by a correct performance of the ritual we have already celebrated the Lord's Supper.

As for 3:3: During the discussion which preceded the actual formulation of the theses, reports Gollwitzer, it was considered unwise to distinguish explicitly between the ordinary and the eucharistic use of the elements. It was also agreed not to insist that "consecration" belongs to the essential acts of the Lord's Supper. There was no agreement among the members of the committee that the *eulogein* of I Cor. 10:16 would mean such a consecration. Furthermore, it was recognized that a doctrine of consecration might appear to suggest a change in the elements and raise such problems as the need for re-consecration after the consecrated elements have been exhausted, and the length of the time during which consecration remains in effect—all problems alien to the New Testament.

Finally, it was recognized that a description of the outward actions alone is not adequate without also stating their intended meaning. This insight accounts for the formulation of 3:4.[48]

Brunner relates that although the committee had rejected some proposals to limit itself to a description of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, it had nevertheless believed it necessary to present the main points of the celebration before stating the actual eucharistic doctrine. This then is accomplished in Thesis 3.[49] As for its content, Brunner is convinced that it follows the Formula of Concord, except for leaving out a reference to consecration, and thereby implicitly

46 *Zur Lehre*, p. 25.
47 *Ibid.*, pp. 25, 26.
48 *Ibid.*, p. 26.
49 *Lehrgespräch*, p. 109.

dmitting that on this specific issue the committee had failed to reach an agree-ient.[50]

Thesis 3:4, suggests Brunner, might perhaps better belong to Thesis 2, since does not describe the outward actions but the inward attitude of the church. nd the latter is not exclusively limited to the Lord's Supper. Yet even so, here e do have a very positive realization, says Brunner, that the Lord's Supper is ot merely a special service of repentance, but likewise includes the remembrance f Christ's death, and this in the light of both the Easter joy and the still coming oy of the final resurrection.[51]

Others: Although generally 3:1 is not questioned, occasional inquiries have een voiced. Thus Hermann Sasse requests a clear statement on private com-nunion. He also suggests that a more precise definition of "congregation" is reatly needed.[52]

The case is similar with 3:2—although accepted by most theologians, it is uestioned by some. The statement of the "Evangelische Bruderkreise Deutsch-nds" understands Gollwitzer to be suggesting that the celebration of the Lord's upper without a sermon is not legitimate and flatly rejects such a viewpoint.[53] asse seeks a clear definition of the term "proclamation." He also raises a very ignificant question: Is not the eucharistic liturgy itself a proclamation?[54]

In regard to 3:3 it is recognized by everyone that a doctrine of consecration as not been affirmed.[55] The more conservative commentators obviously lament his fact. The "Evangelische Bruderkreise Deutschlands" insist that the "blessing" f I Cor. 10:16 does not exclude consecration.[56] The "Landeskirchenamt" in Munich uestions whether the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is ever adequate if it fails to in-lude a consecration, or merely identifies consecration with proclamation and infor-nation.[57] Ernst Sommerlath criticizes the committee's conviction that in the celebra-ion of the Lord's Supper nothing happens to the elements.[58] And Hans Grass in very objectively written statement observes that Thesis 3 fails to affirm tradi-ional Lutheran doctrine.[59] At the same time, the defenders of 3:3 also have a ery powerful argument on their side. Thus Wolfgang Metzger points out that he concept of consecration is not biblical.[60] Even so, Metzger admits that the voidance of even the biblical idea of blessing may well have been an unnecessary aution.

Finally, 3:4 has been accepted except for some minor criticisms.

50 *Ibid.*, pp. 109, 110.
51 *Ibid.*, p. 111.
52 *Ibid.*, p. 301.
53 *Ibid.*, p. 44.
54 *Ibid.*, p. 301.
55 *Zur Lehre*, p. 45; *Lehrgespräch*, p. 263.
56 *Lehrgespräch*, p. 44.
57 *Ibid.*, pp. 31, 32.
58 *Ibid.*, p. 82.
59 *Ibid.*, p. 134.
60 *Ibid.*, p. 275.

Fourth Thesis

The words which our Lord Jesus Christ speaks when he offers the bread and the cup tell us what he himself gives to all who come to this Supper: he, the crucified and risen Lord, permits himself to be taken in his body and blood given and shed for all, through his word of promise, with the bread and wine, and grants us participation, by virtue of the Holy Spirit, in the victory of his lordship, so that we, believing in his promise, may receive forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation.

Gollwitzer acknowledges that in view of the traditional controversies, the formulation of this thesis has been a most difficult task. Yet, clearly, Gollwitzer is unwilling to be bound by the dogmatic deadlocks of the past. He observes that in the sixteenth century the disagreement between Lutherans and Reformed could be stated with such clarity precisely because no one had thought through the ontological presuppositions of the respective viewpoints. The Lutheran distinction between the substance and the use of the Lord's Supper had depended upon the view of Christ's body and blood as separately given things. Although it should not be overlooked that the Lutherans did insist that the body and blood are received in a supernatural manner, nevertheless they still viewed the presence of the body and blood in analogy to the presence of other things. At the same time, the Reformed, without truly solving the problems at hand, had rejected the Lutheran analogy and employed the analogy of spiritual reality. As long as such presuppositions were entertained, no genuine agreement could be expected.

But today the situation has radically changed. Contemporary exegetical studies have opened our eyes to this situation by showing that the words of institution do not really describe the body and blood as things, but state what precisely happens with the body and blood: "the dying and rising of Jesus, and that which is accomplished by this biblical dying and rising: the forgiveness of sins, the new covenant, the eschatological rulership of God, the communion of the Saviour with the saved."

Gollwitzer believes such an insistence on the "personalizing of the real presence" to have been present already in positive and liberal theology ever since the end of the nineteenth century.[61] He admits that Thesis 4 accepts some aspects of this perspective. Notably it speaks about the person of Christ. Yet Thesis 4 avoids two dangerous pitfalls: it does not merely replace a "thing" with a "person," nor does it continue to adhere to ontological categories of thought. Likewise, Thesis 4 goes beyond the affirmations of liberal theology and asserts that we encounter Christ as the one Lord who was truly incarnate, died and rose again, and is now present through his Word in his total existence. And in participating in the fruits of his death, we become contemporaries with his death and resurrection. In order to present such insights, states Gollwitzer, the major attention has been placed on *what* Christ does rather than on *how* he does it. To deal with the latter is to go beyond New Testament evidence.

61 *Zur Lehre*, p. 27.

The words of institution are likewise understood in a new way. They neither consecrate nor merely inform us about what has happened.[62] Instead, as the words of institution proclaim and give a promise, they are "a part of Christ's self-giving."[63]

The following interpretation is also new. Christ's self-giving has now been understood as one act in which Christ both "permits himself to be taken" and "grants us participation." This means, says Gollwitzer, that "the gift which Christ gives is not so much an object as rather a situation in which he gives himself." Hence the uniqueness of the Lord's Supper consists in the fact "that Christ permits and commands us to believe not only through his Word, but that he through his Word makes himself accessible to our outstretched hand, in order that we may receive and embrace him through our corporeal acts."

Thesis 4 does not describe the precise manner in which Christ is received simply because it is neither possible nor permissible. The recurrent reference to the "word of promise" points out the two insights beyond which we cannot proceed: "He says that he gives himself, and he gives himself to be received through his word." In order to adhere to this limit of description, the thesis avoids the use of the traditional Lutheran prepositions "in, under, and with" as well as the Reformed "with." Gollwitzer believes that these prepositions have a tendency to bring about two very serious misunderstandings. To the Reformed, the Lutheran "in, under, and with" appear to suggest that Christ is enclosed in the bread—a view which, of course, the Lutherans have never held. And to the Lutherans, the Reformed use of the preposition "with" raises the mistaken suspicion that it affirms a parallelism,[64] namely, that the partaking of the bread and wine by mouth occurs independently of the partaking of the body and blood of Christ by the believer's soul.[65] Therefore Thesis 4 now affirms "*in* his body and blood given and shed for all, *through* his word of promise, *with* the bread and wine."[66]

The expression "with the bread and wine," which is used in Thesis 4, should not be misinterpreted as a return to Reformed terminology. According to Thesis 4 it is clear that it is Christ himself who is confessed to be the giver of the bread and wine, as it is also affirmed in Thesis 2:1.[67]

The concluding eschatological note of Thesis 4 emphasizes this insight even further. The fact that Christ "permits himself to be taken" is viewed as identical with Christ's "reaching out for us, granting participation in his divine rulership, and taking up our entire existence into obedience" to him.

The reference to the Holy Spirit at this point does not intend to exclude the

62 *Ibid.*, p. 28.
63 *Ibid.*, pp. 28, 29.
64 *Ibid.*, p. 29.
65 *Ibid.*, p. 27.
66 *Ibid.*, p. 29.
67 *Ibid.*, p. 29.

Holy Spirit from the preceding discussion; it only emphasizes that Christ brings about faith and obedience through the Holy Spirit.

Gollwitzer regards the relationship between the Lord's Supper and faith as very important. Here he wants to avoid both the affirmation that faith brings about the reality of the Lord's Supper, and the neglect of the role of faith in the Lord's Supper. Therefore Gollwitzer insists that our faith is brought into existence by Christ as a gift to us. Then he suggests that the means by which the Lord's Supper is given to us is the Word—yet always as the Word which is believed. Gollwitzer is convinced that once the issue is put this way the traditional argument about the *manducatio impiorum* is transcended. Recognizing this, the Reformed members of the committee have been willing to affirm that Christ "gives to all who come" while the Lutheran participants have readily acknowledged that "it is faith alone which receives forgiveness and life in the Supper."[68]

Brunner also recognizes this as the focal statement of the thesis, since all the past eucharistic controversies have centered on the meaning of "this is my body." Brunner likewise informs us that Thesis 4 has been the most difficult to formulate.[69] Without presenting his account of the various stages of the process of formulation, we shall be concerned with his interpretation of the final meaning of the adopted text.

In the first place, Brunner emphasizes the central fact that the reality of the eucharistic gift has been affirmed unequivocally. If an earlier version had spoken about what Christ "will give," Thesis 4 states what Christ actually "gives." And this concerns "all who come to this Supper." That these are baptized church members has been implied. "Concerning these it is stated unconditionally and without exception that when they receive bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, they thereby receive the body and blood of Christ, namely, Christ himself in his sacrificial body and in his sacrificial blood." Even the impenitent and faithless receive the body of Christ, although to their judgment. Thus, observes Brunner, Thesis 4 teaches the traditional Lutheran doctrine of the *manducatio impiorum*.[70]

But what is meant by the "body and blood" of Christ? Brunner admits that this is a difficult question, not yet fully settled. He observes that the members of the committee have agreed that by Christ's body and blood is not meant a "dead, physical matter." At the same time, Brunner refuses to accept the viewpoint that the eucharistic gift, "the body of Christ given for you" and "the blood of Christ shed for you," would be nothing more than the person of Christ.

Brunner suggests the following interpretation. He believes that Thesis 4 denies that the gift of the body and blood of Christ as given in the Lord's Supper is (1) merely a part of Christ's natural or transfigured body, (2) a completely disembodied and spiritual self, (3) a mere participation in the power of the entire *Heilsgeschehen*. Instead, Thesis 4 affirms that we receive the truly incarnate Lord

68 *Ibid.*, p. 30.
69 *Lehrgespräch*, p. 111.
70 *Ibid.*, p. 114.

imself, that is, the total person of Christ. Yet Brunner is also greatly concerned o point out that he does not view person and corporeality as mutually exclusive ategories; instead, he joins them together. Thus when speaking about the in- arnate Christ, we are speaking about the historical person of Christ who in his ery humanity offers himself to his disciples. "Whoever eats the proffered bread, ats him who has become incarnate for our salvation, and who for our salvation ives up his body. The body of Jesus which he gives to his disciples in the bread s in reality *he himself,* who has been given up for us in his entire corporeal umanity united with the *Logos.*"[71] At the same time Brunner admits that the recise relationship between the body and blood on the one hand and the person f Christ on the other remains a mystery which we cannot explain while still in his life.[72]

The expression "permits himself to be taken," though not familiar from past ormulations, is nevertheless a significant expression of Christ's merciful con- lescension to us sinners. It is basically a biblical idea; we encounter it in John 9:16, where the incarnate Lord permits himself to be taken and led away by he captors.

The manner of "taking" Christ in the Lord's Supper has also been described n Thesis 4—"through his word of promise, with the bread and wine." According o Brunner this statement emphasizes the primary importance of the testamental word of Christ, yet without overlooking the important role of the elements. The Word, says Brunner, "rules over the elements," yet together they constitute "the listributing hand of the Lord." Hence we must say that Christ permits us to eceive his body and blood in the Lord's Supper not merely "through his word of promise," but also "with the bread and wine." Here we also need to point out hat the precise relationship between bread and wine and body and blood cannot ever be adequately described through the use of prepositions. Whether, then, we say "with the bread and wine" or "in, under, and with the bread and wine," in either case we are using prepositions which belong to the old aeon and hence fail to describe the new relationship which is essentially an eschatological one.[73] Indeed, admits Brunner, Lutheran theology would prefer the preposition "under," yet, if properly understood, *"with"* is likewise adequate and already used in the Wittenberg Concord of 1536. What matters here is the realization that in the "earthly-historical act of communion" the proffer of bread and wine is identical with the proffer of body and blood. It is to be noted that Brunner regards 5c (below) as a very helpful statement which supports the above outlined under- standing of "with," and hence its legitimate use.

The concluding part of Thesis 4 refers to the Holy Spirit and faith. Brunner believes that this specific location of the reference is very significant. He claims

71 *Ibid.,* p. 115.
72 *Ibid.,* p. 116.
73 *Ibid.,* p. 117.

that the first part of Thesis 4 describes what applies to everyone who partakes of the Lord's Supper. Now in this second, concluding part of Thesis 4 it is taught that a saving reception is possible through the work of the Holy Spirit, who brings the partaker into the victory of Christ's kingdom. At the same time, says Brunner, the impenitent who receive the sacrificial body of Christ without faith necessarily experience the Lordship of Christ to their own judgment.[74]

Others: This central section of the Arnoldshain Theses has received the sharpest criticisms as well as the greatest praise. Thus we are informed by the faculty of the free-church Lutherische Theologische Hochschule Oberursel that Thesis 4 is not even grammatically clear.[75] Hermann Sasse calls the wording of the thesis "very unhappy" and suggests that the lack of clarity in style has originated from the lack of clarity in thinking.[76]

According to the most outspoken critics (for example, the faculty of the Lutherische Theologische Hochschule Oberursel), there is no doubt at all that this thesis has departed altogether from Lutheran theology by rejecting the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence. Specifically, the thesis fails to state clearly that Christ's body and blood are given *vere et substantialiter*. No distinction has been made between *substantia* and *virtus*. Likewise, the thesis fails to speak clearly about eating and drinking.[77] And while in the New Testament the *est* of the institution clearly identifies the bread and the wine with the body and blood of Christ, Thesis 4 speaks instead about an "unspecified" personal presence of Christ, leaving out the New Testament emphasis on realism and objectivity.[78]

It is especially in regard to Thesis 4 that we must record that Brunner's attempts to interpret this thesis as compatible with traditional Lutheran doctrine have failed to elicit general acceptance, although there are some interpreters who follow Brunner.[79]

At the same time, there are also commentators who support the Arnoldshain Theses and are especially appreciative of Thesis 4. Thus the Commission on Theology of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Germany expressed approval of the avoidance of such presently little understood terms as *"res," "substantia,"* and *"materia."*[80] And Professor Kreck voiced his conviction that Thesis 4 successfully removes any further grounds for suspicion on the part of the Reformed that Lutherans might be teaching the real presence in terms of an en-

74 *Ibid.*, p. 118.
75 *Ibid.*, p. 41. The small school is related to the Missouri Synod.
76 *Ibid.*, p. 302.
77 *Ibid.*, p. 39.
78 *Ibid.*, p. 40.
79 *Ibid.*, pp. 76, 80, 158. Albrecht Peters, *Realpräsenz: Luthers Zeugnis von Christi Gegenwart im Abendmahl* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte und Theologie des Luthertums, Band V), Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1960, p. 190.
80 *Lehrgespräch.*, p. 22.

losure in the elements.[81] Gerhard Koch observed that Thesis 4 has successfully vercome the pitfalls of both substantialism and spiritualism.[82]

From such general observations we shall now proceed to a more specific oncern with the major problems. In the first place, we must note that considerable ttention has been devoted to the problem of the relation of eucharistic bread and vine to the body and blood of Christ. Here Hans-Joachim Hulnke reminds us hat in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession the bread and wine are described n terms of a substantial identity with Christ's body and blood.[83] A similar observaion is brought out by Johannes Meister in reference to the New Testament, where he body and blood of Christ are viewed as a *"res"* and clearly distinguished from he person of Christ.[84] Meister also believes that in speaking about the real resence one must specifically affirm Christ's bodily presence, and that Christ gives his gifts bodily for a bodily reception."[85] Wilhelm Mundle states that I Cor. 10:16-17 employs most realistic terms, identifying the eucharistic bread with Christ's body and blood. According to Mundle, such an emphasis is lacking in the Heidelberg Catechism of the Reformed Church—and also in the Arnoldshain Theses.[86]

Unwillingness to regard traditional Lutheran concepts as outdated is further illustrated by the warning of Johannes Meister not to succumb to a superficial dentification between personalistic and biblical categories of thought, and rejecion of all ontological concepts as "Aristotelian, unbiblical, and superseded."[87] In essence this is also Ernst Sommerlath's contention. He is perfectly willing to admit with Thesis 4 that in the Lord's Supper Christ is both the giver and the gift; likewise he is prepared to reject any view concerning the means of grace which would invest them with autonomous powers.[88] At the same time Sommerlath s unwilling to neglect the eucharistic elements, believing that a personal relationship with Christ is not contradictory to concern with the elements. Sommerlath claims that "it belongs to the essence of revelation that the divine reality is hidden (*eingehüllt*) in earthen vessels." He views the body and blood as a substratum and a *"res"* of the person of Christ, and insists that Christ gives this *"res"* at the Lord's Supper in the elements.[89] Yet, says Sommerlath, Thesis 4 does not affirm this. Despite Brunner's claims to the contrary, this thesis speaks in the language of the kerygmatic existentialist theology.[90]

Even some of the interpreters who cannot be classified as thoroughly opposed

81 *Zur Lehre*, pp. 42, 43.
82 *Lehrgespräch*, p. 225.
83 *Ibid.*, p. 199.
84 *Ibid.*, p. 262.
85 *Ibid.*, p. 264.
86 *Ibid.*, pp. 67, 68.
87 *Ibid.*, p. 263, cf. p. 31.
88 *Ibid.*, p. 78.
89 *Ibid.*, p. 79.
90 *Ibid.*, p. 80.

to the Arnoldshain Theses speak about the "dynamic actualism" and "personalism" of Thesis 4.[91]

At the same time, of course, there are also sincere defenders of the Arnoldshain Theses in general and Thesis 4 in particular. We will refer only to the crucial fact observed by Willi Marxsen and others that the New Testament scholars have failed to agree what is meant by bread and wine. Marxsen believes that a precise definition of bread and wine is not possible.[92] The exegete may indeed follow Eduard Schweitzer's intentionally overstated observation and suggest that the Hellenistic-thinking early Christians would have understood the Lord's Supper not unlike the later Lutheran interpreters, while the Hebrew Christians would have thought more in terms of the Reformed tradition.[93] "But how," asks Marxsen, "is one to translate this insight into dogmatic language? Can one say more except that Christ permits himself to be distributed in the Lord's Supper?"[94]

Extensive comments have also been devoted to the phrase "with the bread and wine." The origin of this phrase is usually sought in such sixteenth century attempts at mediation between Lutherans and Reformed as the Wittenberg Concord (1536) and the altered Augsburg Confession.[95] Generally it appears that those scholars who suggest this origin of the phrase also characterize it as Melanchthonian, as covering up rather than actually solving the differences. Wolfgang Metzger suggests still a third source, the Catechism of Johannes Brenz, and defends the phrase as biblical and hence fully adequate.[96]

In regard to the traditional Lutheran description of the eucharistic presence of Christ by the prepositions "in, under, and with," Hans Grass notes that they are present in the theses, yet employed in a different sense. "Under" is not used in Thesis 4, but occurs in 2:1, where it describes an *unio actionis* rather than the traditionally Lutheran *unio substantialis*. The "in" of Thesis 4 does not refer to the relationship between the present Christ and the actions of the Lord's Supper, but instead speaks about the Lord who "permits himself to be taken in his body and blood." The "through" means "through his word of promise" rather than through the elements; such as interpretation is already suggested by 2:1.[97]

Ernst Sommerlath, however, points out that the use of the prepositions "in, under, and with" is not really decisive.[98] Luther himself had regarded these prepositions only as helpful when explaining the presence of Christ to the congregation and to children. Strictly and theologically speaking, Sommerlath holds Luther believed that we cannot go beyond saying that "the bread *is* the body

91 *Ibid.*, pp. 137, 159.
92 *Ibid.*, p. 65.
93 *Ibid.*, pp. 60, 66, 67, 182; *Zur Lehre*, p. 23.
94 *Lehrgespräch*, p. 65.
95 *Ibid.*, pp. 49, 84, 135, 183; Albrecht Peters, *op. cit.*, p. 197.
96 *Lehrgespräch*, p. 277.
97 *Ibid.*, p. 135.
98 *Ibid.*, pp. 84, 85.

nd the wine *is* the blood of Christ," and must leave "how" it is brought about God.[99]

Finally, several important questions have been raised in regard to the problem the *manducatio impiorum*. Following Gollwitzer's official commentary, Kreck sists that the old controversy has been solved by transcending it. The gift and ie giver have been identified, and the gift is no longer viewed as a "something." ence to speak about a *manducatio impiorum* is meaningless.[100] On the other and, presumably following Brunner, Johannes Klevinghaus insists that Thesis 4 firms the *manducatio oralis* and hence the *manducatio impiorum*.[1] Other inter- eters have not been that certain. The "Landeskirchenamt" in Munich questions hat it is that unbelievers really receive.[2] The "Michaelsbruderschaft" thinks that hesis 4 speaks only about a worthy reception of the Lord's Supper.[3] Hans rass observes that the "he gives to all" of Thesis 4 affirms more than would e expressed by "he will give to all"—yet it is less than to say with the traditionally utheran affirmation that "all receive."[4] Indeed, it is precisely at this point that ans Grass questions Brunner's interpretation very seriously.[5]

Fifth Thesis

herefore, what happens in the Lord's Supper is not adequately described,

) when it is taught that, by means of the Lord's words of institution, bread and wine are nanged into a supernatural substance, thus ceasing to be bread and wine;
) when it is taught that a repetition of the act of salvation takes place in the Lord's Supper;
) when it is taught that in the Lord's Supper either natural or supernatural "matter" is istributed;
) when it is taught that there are two parallel but separate processes which take place, ie an eating on the part of the body and the other an eating on the part of the soul;
) when it is taught that the eating on the part of the body as such saves one, or that articipation in the body and blood of Christ is a purely mental or spiritual matter.

Gollwitzer informs us that Thesis 5 had been agreed upon by the committee ather readily. This thesis rejects (a) transubstantiation, (b) a repeated repre- entation in the sense of the mystery cults and the Roman Catholic eucharistic acrifice, (c) the materialistic understanding of substance as taught by Lutheran Orthodoxists, (d) a division between earthly and heavenly transactions as implied y old Reformed Confessions, (e) a saving power in bodily eating itself (which Zwingli had regarded as Luther's teaching) or a mere spiritual participation in

99 *Ibid.*, p. 85.
100 *Zur Lehre*, pp. 45, 46.
1 *Lehrgespräch*, p. 210.
2 *Ibid.*, p. 31.
3 *Ibid.*, p. 51.
4 *Ibid.*, p. 138.
5 *Ibid.*, pp. 138, 139, cf. 41.

Christ through belief as a process of consciousness (which Lutherans had once thought to be the teaching of the Reformed).[6]

Brunner observes that as a whole Thesis 5 is preeminently lucid and requires no detailed explanation. At the same time Brunner wants to underline that this thesis does not contradict traditional Lutheran doctrine.

With two cardinal issues Brunner deals in greater detail. In the first place, Brunner calls our attention to the fact that the *manducatio oralis* is taught in 5e and 5d by insisting that participation in the body and blood of Christ is not an exclusively spiritual process, which would rule out a bodily partaking. Thesis 5 admits, of course, that not every bodily eating is also spiritual, but it makes clear that in the Lord's Supper bodily and spiritual eating always do coincide, and this is good Lutheran doctrine![7]

Secondly, Brunner turns to 5c. Although it explicitly rejects a partaking of natural or supernatural *matter,* it does not thereby intend, says Brunner, to deny that what we receive in the Lord's Supper is corporeal. "Rather, the corporeality of the eucharistic gift is affirmed beyond question as far as these theses are concerned." Therefore it is wrong to imagine that the theses would set forth any such spiritualizing and personalistic interpretation of the body and blood of Christ which would exclude the concept of "substance." And Brunner notes that 5c speaks about "matter" (*Stoff*) and not about substance—and reminds us of the vast difference between matter and substance.[8] This leads Brunner to conclude that the traditional Lutheran doctrine of the substantial presence of Christ's body and blood is not rejected.[9]

Others: Hans Grass observes that although the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation is rejected clearly in 5a, the traditional Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation (*sic*) has not in any way been affirmed.[10] Ernst Sommerlath wonders whether 5a does not also reject the Lutheran emphasis on substance.[11] In 5b, also, the rejection of Roman Catholic doctrine is clearly recognizable. Hans Grass inquires whether the committee has here thought to include the modern idea of representation, taught by a few Lutherans.[12]

Although 5c can be interpreted in several ways,[13] more support seems to exist for Gollwitzer's position.[14] Hans Grass views Brunner's exposition as "artificial."[15] The "Landeskirchenamt" in Munich wonders whether 5c does not

6 *Zur Lehre,* p. 28.
7 *Lehrgespräch,* p. 119.
8 *Ibid.,* p. 119.
9 *Ibid.,* p. 120.
10 *Ibid.,* p. 141.
11 *Ibid.,* pp. 81, 82, 141, ftn. 26.
12 *Ibid.,* p. 141.
13 *Ibid.,* cf. p. 211.
14 *Zur Lehre,* p. 43.
15 *Lehrgespräch,* p. 143.

eject the real presence and the *manducatio oralis*.[16] Both Ernst Sommerlath[17] nd Hermann Sasse[18] observe that the literal presence of a "dead, physical matter" as never been taught by anyone. And Sommerlath reminds us that Luther, who ndeed spoke about Christ's body and blood as *re vera et substantialiter*, never- neless also emphasized that we are not receiving a material thing but a corporeal ift in which the Holy Spirit has embedded himself.[19]

Kreck, a member of the Reformed Church, willingly admits that 5d is definitely criticism of the Reformed position.[20] H. Grass and E. Sommerlath[21] hasten to oint out that such a criticism does not necessarily favor the Lutheran position, is Brunner suggested.

Although Gollwitzer's explanation of 5e is accepted by such a careful inter- reter as H. Grass,[22] Johannes Klevinghaus suggests that the statement is mbiguous.[23]

Sixth Thesis

. Jesus Christ, who saved us from the wrath of God's judgment which brings death, is both he beginning and the head of a new creation.

. Through him, we who receive his body and his blood are united in his body, the church, nd are made partakers of the promised new covenant which God has instituted through the lood of Jesus.

. The Lord's Supper places us within the fellowship of the brethren and thus testifies to us he fact that what enslaves and divides us in this aeon has been broken down in Christ and hat, in the midst of the sinners he has pardoned, the Lord has inaugurated a new humanity.

Gollwitzer: Thesis 6 is to be regarded as an attempt to seek in New Testa- nent exegesis new insights by which to overcome the non-biblical concern over such issues as "What is given with the bread and wine?" and "What is the rela- ionship between the body and blood and the bread and wine?"[24] Here Pauline christological thought is of great help, as it always views the Lord's Supper in he perspective of Christ's total person and work. The new creation of God of which we become partakers in the Lord's Supper is recognized to be identical with the person of Christ. It is in this manner that the new creation enters into he old. Hence it can be said that the Lord's Supper establishes the church as the body of Christ by continuously overcoming the separation which exists between men as sinners.

Such an approach, insists Gollwitzer, successfully overcomes the traditional

16 *Ibid.*, p. 31.
17 *Ibid.*, p. 82.
18 *Ibid.*, p. 303.
19 *Ibid.*, p. 82.
20 *Zur Lehre*, p. 43.
21 *Lehrgespräch*, pp. 144, 75.
22 *Ibid.*, p. 146.
23 *Ibid.*, p. 211.
24 *Zur Lehre*, p. 30.

and yet unbiblical cleavage between dogmatics and ethics. It leads us beyond a limited understanding of the Lord's Supper as merely the forgiveness of sins. It witnesses to the totality of the renewal which has taken place, overcoming every form of separation between men,—"racial, national, social, moral, etc."[25]

Brunner: According to Brunner, Thesis 6 points out the very significant eschatological and ecclesiastical implications of the Lord's Supper. Thus, following I Cor. 10:17, this thesis asserts that by partaking of Christ's body and blood, out of many we become one body, the church. Further, the thesis recognizes that on account of the work of Christ, the church is the realm within which God creates something eschatologically new (*ein endzeitlich Neues*), which may be defined with one word: love (*agape*). Hence any actions which are contrary to *agape* are also contrary to the body of Christ, the church.[26]

Others: Except for some rather insignificant inquiries, Hermann Sasse's observation appears to stand: "Theses 6 and 7 are correct."[27]

Seventh Thesis

1. The Lord's Supper places us on the way of Christ's cross. The cross points out the way for us into the reality of this world. Where we are weak, the grace of God is strong. When we die, we live with him. His victory is still hidden beneath temptation and suffering. That is why the Lord feeds us through his Supper, in order to strengthen us in the struggle into which he sends his own, and in order to arm us against every kind of enthusiasm as well as every kind of lethargy, so as to prevent us either from anticipating that which is to come in deceptive dreams or from giving up in despair.
2. In the congregation to which he gives himself in the Lord's Supper we are brethren. This fellowship depends for its life on the love with which he first loved us. He, the righteous, has accepted us, the unrighteous; he, the free, has accepted us, the bound; he, the exalted, has accepted us, the lowly. In the same way, we also must share all that we are and have with those who need us.

Gollwitzer: Thesis 7 makes clear that the Lord's Supper is a meal for pilgrims who still live under the cross. This means, states Gollwitzer, that while in this world, we are subject to "suffering, weakness, defeat, and death." The immediate and complete bypassing of this reality is not possible for us; to do so is to exchange the world of reality for the world of wishful thinking. At the same time, however, we definitely do not stand under the cross as though defeated, but through faith we participate in the victory of Christ.

Section 7:2, insists Gollwitzer, is not a repetition of 6:3 but goes beyond it. If 6:3 taught that the Lord's Supper unites formerly separated men in brotherly love, then 7:2 speaks of this same love as applied to the entire world, reaching out in a true imitation of Christ to all who presently are not yet brothers of the faith.[28]

25 *Ibid.*, p. 31.
26 *Lehrgespräch*, p. 120.
27 *Ibid.*, p. 303.
28 *Ibid.*, p. 32.

Brunner states that 7:1 warns us against a false sectarian enthusiasm which obliterates the distinction between the present participation in the victory of Christ and a complete sharing of it at the return of Christ. Thus the church continues to live under the cross, struggling with the powers of darkness, yet also participating in Christ's Easter victory.[29]

Eighth Thesis

1. Faith receives what is promised to it and builds on this promise, not on any worthiness of its own.
2. The word of God warns us against any disregard for and misuse of the Lord's Supper, so that we do not sin against the majesty of this gift and bring down God's judgment upon us.
3. Because the Lord is generous to all who call upon him, all the members of his church are called to this Supper, and the forgiveness of sins is promised to all who long for the righteousness of God.

Gollwitzer: 8:1 spells out two concerns which are basic to the Reformed and Lutheran understandings of the Lord's Supper. Although, as already stated in Thesis 4, Christ gives himself "to all who come," the Reformed tradition has rightly emphasized that the reception of Christ is possible only in faith. Yet, in order to exclude a false estimate of our faith as the basis of assurance for our worthy reception of the Lord's Supper, the traditional Lutheran emphasis is also included. Approaching the issue in the perspective of the moments of tribulation when faith is assailed, wavers, and cannot find security in itself,[30] Thesis 8:1 asserts that we receive Christ not in virtue of the strength of our faith but precisely in our very weakness on the strength of God's promise.

Without an attempt to classify and evaluate all the possible offenses against the Lord's Supper, Thesis 8:2 warns against "disregard" and "misuse." Such a warning is indeed necessary, yet according to Gollwitzer it should never assume the same significance as the proclamation of salvation which alone is the essential concern of the Lord's Supper. Gollwitzer believes that such a wrong emphasis was present in the traditional Lutheran doctrine of the *manducatio impiorum*. Indeed, Lutherans have even employed the doctrine of *manducatio impiorum* as a major proof for belief in the real presence. I Cor. 11, states Gollwitzer, does not support such an approach.

Eligibility for the Lord's Supper is viewed in 8:3 as conditioned by baptism and church membership. This means that the Lord's Supper is not to be offered universally; it is not an instrument for missionary activity. At the same time, Gollwitzer admits that the committee was not willing to define negatively the boundaries of church membership, i.e. to say who are not members of the church. Hence 8:3 states positively that "the Lord is generous to all who call upon

29 *Ibid.*, p. 121.
30 *Zur Lehre*, p. 32.

him" and affirms that Christ promises forgiveness to all who truly seek his righteousness.[31]

Brunner: 8:1 addresses itself to the inquiry which Luther raised in the Small Catechism, Who receives the sacrament worthily? As in the Small Catechism, the communicant is counseled not to rely primarily on his own subjective estimate of himself but through faith to reach out for God's promise to him.

Judging from the context, says Brunner, it is perfectly clear that 8:3 does not invite the impenitent. The invitation merely attempts to guard against a false self-exclusion on the basis of unworthiness.[32]

Others: Two important inquiries have been made concerning the expression "the majesty of this gift" in 8:2. The "Michaelsbruderschaft" reminds us that the phrase differs from I Cor. 11:27, which speaks very explicitly about sinning against the proffered body and blood of the Lord.[33] Willi Marxsen points out that the description "the majesty of the gift" is inconsistent since it contradicts Theses 2:2 and 3:2, which do not exalt one means of grace above another.[34]

The faculty of the "Lutherische Theologische Hochschule Oberursel" regard the statement in 8:3 as "especially unclear." They desire to know whether it expresses merely a pastoral concern, advocates open communion, or even suggests intercommunion.[35]

As the preceding commentary shows, a unanimous acceptance of the Arnoldshain Theses has not taken place. Nevertheless, a very serious discussion has begun. And I believe that it has not been fruitless.

The very fact that Lutheran, Reformed, and Union theologians have been desirous of studying the Scriptures together is already a very significant advance over conditions in the sixteenth century. It is also to be noted that the members of the committee that produced the theses have been able to agree among themselves. Whatever may be said against the theses, I believe that Gollwitzer's witness should not be discounted when he asserts that the theses were not a compromise. The committee members have genuinely believed that they could subscribe the theses without betraying their own heritage and faith—and without leaving out any of the truly decisive New Testament affirmations about the meaning of the Lord's Supper. Obviously this was possible only because modern exegesis has called in question several of the interpretations of the sixteenth century. Thus the new formulations were adopted not by combining Lutheran and Reformed views—which is not really possible anyway—but by interpreting Scriptures anew. Such understanding seems to have been guided by the perfectly reasonable assumption that not everything that has been said in one century must be regarded as infallible or final. But, of course, this also accounts for the numerous criticisms of the theses.

31 *Ibid.*, p. 33.
32 *Lehrgespräch*, p. 122.
33 *Ibid.*, p. 51.
34 *Ibid.*, pp. 63, 64.
35 *Ibid.*, p. 41.

f the committee could question sixteenth century interpretations, it is not at all urprising that its own insights should also be questioned. The fact remains that ontemporary exegesis knows no unanimity, and hence one should not even expect readily achievable doctrinal unanimity.

But to say this is not to dismiss the entire undertaking. It is rather to praise oth the authors of the theses and their critics. And it is also to suggest that one f the greatest dangers for any church lies precisely in such an estimate of its loctrine that it refuses to speak about it—and think about it in the light of the criptural witness. Thus whatever else the Arnoldshain Theses may have achieved, hey do provide us with excellent material for a creative re-thinking of the doctrine f the Lord's Supper.

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

The Outsider and the Word of God. A Study in Christian Communication. By James E. Sellers. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1961. 240 pages. $4.00.

This book brings together the deepest and soundest theological analysis and the most fruitful and rewarding practical application. It deserves responsible reading by pastors, professors, and laymen alike. It is a study of the means of communicating the gospel in a generation when mass media have become determinative forces of society.

The author, James E. Sellers, professor of theology and ethics in Vanderbilt University, begins by defining the term *outsider*. In one sense, because of sin, we are all outsiders to God and his Word. In another sense, because of our creation in God's image, we are all insiders. Yet the Word of God has been spoken and the resulting church has distinguished the redeemed family of God from those who need to be brought in from outside. Significantly, due to the secularization of our cultures, there are many nominal Christians who are really outsiders because they live by the standards of the world rather than by the compulsion of the gospel. Others are outside the church but not untouched by the gospel because it has permeated our culture. The task of the church is to speak its message in such a way as to make those inside the church realize when they are operating with a secular standard of values, and to make those outside the church realize that it is the gospel which gives life and not the limited structures of this world. The Christian apologetic must therefore make its point of contact not in any virtues or abilities of the outsider, but in the "point of conflict" where the outsider is caught in sin against God. To make this point of contact where the outsider is in conflict with God, the Christian communicator must step outside the circle of the insider and use language or symbols to which the outsider is accustomed.

This will be just the reverse of the demythologizing advocated by Bultmann. Contrasting the second century apologetics of Justin and Tertullian with that of Marcion and Valentinus, Sellers observes that secular symbols were used to convey a Christian message, while the gnostics used Christian symbols to proclaim a message about their pleroma of aeons. So likewise we should use the symbol of *anxiety* today because it can convey to the outsider both an understanding of his own existence and also the need for a redemption which goes beyond the illusory panaceas of the world. Unlike Bultmann, who would have us scuttle Christian symbols because they are outmoded or incredible, Sellers, with a surer and more reverent realism, wishes to get rid of Christian symbols when dealing with the outsider because they are too familiar.

We must be wary, in our use of mass media, of speaking directly about the gospel because it may too easily become just one good interspersed among other relative goods and thereby lose its absolute claim of both judgment and mercy. Using Tillich's analysis of existence with the limiting categories of time, space, causality, and substance, Sellers advocates an indirect approach to the outsider through his anxieties. Man finds his being threatened by non-being through the passing of time. This is exploited by the world in the daily newspaper's front-page reporting of death-dealing tragedies which cut short our time and hence our being. Our anxiety over loss of being through the threat of spacelessness is allayed in the world by weekly newspapers which exploit the deep roots of small town existence. Our anxiety over the meaningless drift of existence is assuaged through the weekly news magazines which analyze causes of events, deluding us with a short-term relativistic view of history. And finally our anxiety over the need for being some-

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

thing is exploited adroitly by the advertising media which seek to give us status through creating and then satisfying wants, or by the society pages which deliver us from the fear of oblivion by the permanence of pictures.

In every case the world offers a false salvation either by augmenting the anxiety and then assuaging it by a false panacea, or by deluding the worldling by denying the anxiety altogether. The Christian apologist and communicator has the more difficult task of acknowledging the reality of the anxiety, exposing it to be the result of a sinful relationship with God, and then providing the redeeming force of the gospel in language which is meaningful to a world of outsiders.

ROBERT PAUL ROTH

The Suburban Captivity of the Churches. By Gibson Winter. Garden City: Doubleday, 1961. 216 pages. $3.50.

The City Church: Death or Renewal. By Walter Kloetzli. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1961. 224 pages. $3.75.

These two books, one by a professor in Ethics and Society in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, the other by the secretary of urban church planning, Division of American Missions, National Lutheran Council, offer two differing approaches to the same fundamental problem. Pastors and congregations will answer the questions they raise, whether they wish to or not and whether they regard these books as important or not; they will respond either by default or by decision. Candidly, more will do the former than the latter; pastors will do so because they are as much implicated in the captivity of the churches as their congregations are.

What is at stake in the decision which confronts the ecclesiastical policy-makers (in parish and district office, synods, and national boards) is well stated in the title of Kloetzli's book: it is nothing less than death or renewal. Or, as the title of Professor Winter's book indicates (echoing Luther's challenging indictment of the Babylonian captivity of the church in his day), the church has become the captive of the dominant socio-cultural reality of our day, the suburb. Contemporary Protestantism is a *Kultur-Protestantismus* expressing itself in the organizational church which caters to the organization man who serves the corporate power centers of our society.

The central concern of his book, says Winter, is the creation of "a human environment in the metropolis." Its specific concern is to assess the role of the churches in this process. The response of the church to this urban environment, particularly in the inner city and the older residential neighborhoods, is the subject of the case histories which Kloetzli presents. The data for these histories are drawn from the churches studied in the National Lutheran Council's part of the NCCCUSA study of effective city churches, i.e. these are specifically studies of how existing congregations have wrestled, well or poorly, with the challenges of the changing metropolitan environment.

The characteristics of the urban environment are well summarized in the two principles of social organization which Winter describes: the *interdependence* of urban life and the development of *communal insulation.* The result is a kind of polarization of life in the metropolis. Thus the economic and political life of the urban world is the arena in which interdependent forces contend with one another, often setting in motion vast processes of social change. The attempt to establish self-contained homogeneous areas of family living on the urban circumference and in the suburbs reflects the efforts at communal insulation. How churches are affected by these processes may well be read from a number of the case histories in Kloetzli's book. The interdependence of the urban forces is perhaps somewhat taken for granted, although its effects can be seen in the history of St. John's Church or Immanuel, both of which, especially in their weekday programs, attempt to struggle with the dynamic swirl of events in which they are caught. The impact of population turnover, with efforts at communal insulation or of response to meet this challenge, can be seen in the chapters devoted to Bethlehem and Trinity.

What has happened can be described from two perspectives. The first is the sundering

of economic interdependence from personal association. Even in Kloetzli's most successful church, Bethlehem, we must admit that this has in large measure happened. The members do not constitute a residential community; although the church has responded courageously to the problems of racial change, it does not have within its power any means for wrestling with the fact that little in the patterns of life in the metropolis will ordinarily bring the Negro and white members of this church into interaction with one another during the week. Though in the large impersonal processes of metropolitan life the members of Bethlehem are inextricably bound together as interdependent units, there is little to make them personally aware of those bonds. Their "fellowship" thus can hardly illuminate their interdependence, nor does the interdependence, since it is mediate and impersonal, contribute directly to their fellowship.

Secondly, all of this means also that little effective communication is really possible, even in this "most successful" instance. For the common experiences of faith are not anchored in common experiences of work and play, in cooperative activity in the community from Monday through Saturday.

I have drawn specific attention to this congregation because we may say that within the framework of its resources it did whatever was possible; what is going on is not something that can simply be blamed on an individual or a congregation as such. The processes of change in the metropolis are so much vaster, more impersonal, more inevitable that even at best any single organization can only conduct a kind of delaying action. Effective response requires a more comprehensive offensive with greater resources and along a broader front.

But Bethlehem is the exception. The more typical social form, particularly in the suburbs, is the "organization church." Here we meet the basic fact that in the shift from rural to metropolitan life, the development of the churches has been arrested. They have invested their future in the social homogeneity of the insulated communities. In doing so, they have betrayed the Body of Christ. How this happened, Professor Winter documents in a variety of ways, and he also spells out its form in the especial instances of the ethnic and the Negro churches. The predecessor church of Trinity offers one illustration of this pressure.

The diagnosis is simple; the church no longer speaks in a meaningful fashion to the whole range of human concerns, nor does its program touch on these in any effective or relevant manner. It has centered its efforts primarily on the private concern of people; its major activity has been to serve "the family"; its chief technique for binding up wounds has been "pastoral counseling," the substitution of a kind of psychological pietism for the principled personal morality of the past. The implications of this are rather sharply explored in John Updike's novel, *Rabbit Run* (Knopf, 1960). As Kloetzli's case histories suggest, even churches located where they have access to larger opportunities have often not seized them. They have become islands of withdrawal into private life, often trivializing the gospel into psychological categories in the process.

Theologically, such a response may be seen as a betrayal of the doctrine of the incarnation. For the Christ of the cross is betrayed when the church surrenders part of the world as beyond its effective concern.

What is crucial for us is, of course, the social embodiment of the Protestant churches in the "organization church." For we must ask how, in the structures of a particular period of history, the church becomes visible. We must also recognize the degree to which structure defines function. Thus, just as Luther saw in the Babylonian captivity of the medieval church that the Gospel was imprisoned and perverted, so we must say that the organization church represents a deformation of the church and a perversion of the Gospel. Furthermore, a deformed church is headed for death, perhaps a slow or lingering one, under the illusion that it is still healthy. If the church is to be renewed, it must be reformed. This involves more, infinitely more, than a change of attitude. It means change of attitude. It means change in structure. Organization must become mission.

This is the issue before the churches which

these two books present. Whether the majority of the pastors of Protestant churches hear of these books, whether they read them or not, is not the important question. It would trivialize these books to say that every pastor ought to read them. For consciously or unconsciously each congregation, each ecclesiastical body in our day stands before the alternatives. No prophets on rooftops are required. By their deeds, the clergy and the congregations will give the answers. By default they may drift into death; by decision they may recapture a sense of mission to the whole community. They will give an answer —they will fail and be replaced or they may succeed and be renewed. The answers are coming in right now in the deliberations of boards and synods, parishes and pastoral conferences. The portents are not good—but we cannot say that the diagnosis has not been given or the direction of choice pointed out to us.

KARL H. HERTZ

The German Phoenix. By Franklin Hamlin Littell. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1960. 226 pages. $3.95.

Fully as remarkable as the economic recovery of West Germany is the revitalization of the German church through the powerful lay movements represented by the Kirchentag and the evangelical academies. It is high time that the story of the rise of this phoenix be told to the English-speaking world. It is vividly narrated here. Dr. Littell, professor of Church History at Southern Methodist University and co-editor of the *Weltkirchenlexikon,* is well qualified to perform this task, for he knows the language, the men, and the events.

The story begins properly with the church struggle during the Nazi domination. "Most Americans," affirms the author, "have as yet no awareness of the extent of the resistance to Nazi totalitarianism within Germany." This is not surprising, for wartime censorship included a personal directive from President Roosevelt to newsmen, forbidding all mention of German resistance to Hitler since the existence of such resistance did not fit into the concept of unconditional surrender. Yet it was the "tough Christians" bearing heroic witness to their Lord amid the terrors of Nazism, men like Bonhoeffer, Lilje, and Niemoeller, who made the churches the only centers of leadership to survive the Third Reich and the period of denazification in sound condition. And it was they who prepared the way for the resurgence of vital applied Christianity in post-war Germany.

The author grasps clearly the basic theology underlying the Christian resistance and coming to pointed expression in the Barmen articles of 1934 and the Stuttgart declaration of guilt in 1945. It is "the discipline of the word of God made articulate and meaningful in a concrete situation." It is eschatological rather than moralistic, and it demands a clear-cut choice between the genuine Christian hope and the spirit of the times. It is a revolt against both the idealism and the empiricism of the nineteenth century churches. The former verbalized ideals which were not really commitments, and the latter substituted an internalized and sentimentalized religious "experience" for a confrontation of the realities of history.

The disciplined and united witness of the church, true to its own mission and aware of the claims of history, becomes articulate in the Kirchentag, described as "the magnetic pole of laymen's movements throughout the world." The dramatic life story of Reinold von Thadden and the phenomenal development of the movement which he started are excitingly portrayed. The purpose of the laymen's rally, according to von Thadden himself, is to take seriously five dimensions of life: "the *time* in which we have been born, the *world* in which we live, the *human being* to whom we belong, the *living God* who is calling us, and the *Christian community,* the lay apostolate."

The implications of the lay apostolate are most thoroughly explored in the evangelical academies and lay training institutes which have spread from Germany to many other countries in Europe and have now reached a total of sixty in number. In providing the opportunity for full, free, and informed airing of contemporary issues, they play an important role in the political life of the nation. The continuous and vigorous open discussion which helps to shape policy de-

cisions on the basis of the best available wisdom is an effective safeguard against totalitarian "homogenization of all human relations." But above all they teach laymen of various professions the Christian meaning of vocation and witness. There they learn that discipleship is not a matter of vague feelings and idle words, that "no position should be verbalized until a Christian is prepared to make it a matter of disciplined witness."

Are we in America to organize a Kirchentag and evangelical academies of our own? To many it appears that with our organizational ability and our present revival of spirituality we need simply to put our shoulders to the wheel and push. The author is not so optimistic. In fact, he regards our popular religiosity which deifies "the American way of life" as being almost as demonized as the "German Christianity" which the men of the resistance movement fought. And the moral idealism which masquerades as theology in our churches does not produce authentic Christian witness. There are hopeful beginnings, however, in the search for new depth and integrity in our work with laymen. We can learn from our European brethren to make a fruitful adaptation to our own situation of the recovery of lay initiative and of the values in group dynamics. We can learn to give up our old idols of success and efficiency, to stop giving our laymen "the stone of institutional promotion as substitute for the bread of life," and to give the lordship of Christ precedence over the P.T.A. and the Chamber of Commerce.

Dr. Littell's report on the European lay activities is accurate and informative. His indictment of the American churches is incisive and for the most part justified. Some of his value judgments, however, are vulnerable. Thus his allocation of the entire blame for "the scandal of Marxism" to the apostasy of the nineteenth century churches and his wholesale condemnation of American Protestantism as obsolete culture-religion are as open to question as his characterization of Nietzsche, Marx, and Freud as "three of the four greatest theological (!) thinkers of the nineteenth century." But in spite of its occasional lapses into unwarranted generalization, this is a timely and stimulating book. Its salty criticism spurs and supplements the efforts of those who are working constructively to give depth and substance to the laymen's work of the church.

T. A. KANTONEN

Luther and Culture. By George W. Forell, Harold Grimm, and Theodore Hoelty-Nickel. Decorah, Iowa: Luther College Press, 1960. 211 pages. $3.00.

This is the fourth volume in the noteworthy Martin Luther Lecture Series at Luther College. Like its predecessors, it takes an aspect of the Reformer's teachings or influence and makes it known and relevant to the twentieth century American church.

George W. Forell, professor in Iowa State University, contributed the first three chapters under the title "Luther and Politics." It is hard to imagine anyone accomplishing more than Forell accomplishes in so little space. He carefully elucidates Luther's notion of "the political use of the law" and then moves into the Wittenberg theologian's application of the same to foreign policy and domestic politics. With a perception of Luther's actual and fluctuating predicaments that is as erudite as it is sensitive. Forell explains the pressures and responsibilities which led Luther to speak and act politically. Without giving the impression of trying to rescue Luther from the superficial critics who would blame him for everything from established religion to Nazism, Forell "gets Luther off the hook" over and over again by relating his various and seemingly inconsistent statements and actions to a larger ethic. Thus consistency is established for Luther and hope is given to the Christian who must "obey God rather than man" in a society that is every bit as complicated as was Luther's. Here is a fine introduction to Luther and politics.

Harold J. Grimm, well-known historian from Ohio State University, contributed the second section on "Luther and Education." Here the reader finds a short and helpful record of Luther's interest in and efforts on behalf of the education of children, pastors, lawyers, and others. It is all true and im-

portant. This reviewer found occasion to differ with Grimm only at the point of Luther's method of interpreting the Scriptures. Grimm says (p. 99) that Luther discarded all methods except the literal. This position would be difficult to defend. Anyone who has the slightest doubt about Luther's advocacy of education would have all of them unceremoniously removed if he read these chapters. He might also discover, as did this reader, that Grimm's flare for inclusiveness and accuracy is not matched by a flare for the exciting and dramatic.

The third section on "Luther and Music" is by Theodore Hoelty-Nickel, head of the Department of Music at Valparaiso University. This is exciting reading! The contents defy summary but will educate and inspire anyone but the expert in music and liturgy. Music in public worship will "interpret and bring the text home to the congregation" (p. 148). Music is a gift of God and can be an echo to God's Word. Music can and should be a handmaiden of religion. There is rich instruction in these pages in justification both of music and the proper types and uses of the same. The translation of Luther's *Deutsche Messe* and instructions is proof positive that the Reformer held an evangelical view of worship and the Lord's Supper. Luther cannot be classified as a sacramentarian, a "low church" casualist or a "high church" legalist. He apparently believed in freedom and permitted variation as long as the sacrament of the altar was offered evangelically. In this instance we find Luther advocating the singing of the Creed, which, of course, makes him a dangerous heretic to all unimaginative conservatives who have not taken the trouble to study the fascinating history of worship practices.

This is good reading. Hats off to the authors and to Luther College for making this book available!

L. Dale Lund

The Concept of Newness in the New Testament. By Roy A. Harrisville. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1960. 126 pages. $1.95.

The volume here reviewed is the first of a new Theological Monograph series which will be published from time to time by Augsburg. The author, who is a professor of New Testament at Luther Seminary in St. Paul, here presents in book form the subject of his doctoral dissertation. It is Harrisville's contention that, contrary to the usual treatment of *kainos* as newness in a qualitative sense and of *neos* as newness in a temporal sense, the two terms in the New Testament are actually synonymous. Both carry both connotations. When this is rightly seen, then the meaning of newness in the New Testament can be understood, and its centrality to all New Testament thinking can be discerned. Whether the writers employ *kainos* or *neos,* they are, according to Harrisville, focusing attention upon the eschatological element in the event of Jesus Christ and in the preaching of it. It is in fact this connection between the idea of newness and eschatology which makes the book valuable and distinct, and the author makes it clear that neither newness nor eschatology can be divorced from the historical framework. God acts in history, has acted in history to bring into existence the eschatological new age! A number of related New Testament ideas, Harrisville finds, supports the view that the newness of that age is both qualitative and temporal. These ideas are the new covenant, the new life, the new creation, the new tongues, the new man, the new commandment, and the new heaven and earth. A long chapter is devoted to the eschatological aspect of these ideas, to which the concept of newness gives expression and unity. Of particular value in the book is Chapter II, "The Biblical Meaning of Newness," in which the author makes it apparent that newness in the New Testament involves an awareness of a continuity and contrast between the earthly and heavenly, a finality with respect to God's redemptive activity in Christ, and an "intrinsic energy or dynamic."

Although the publisher's insertions of the Greek words into the text are jarring to the eye (the Greek letters were made by a typewriter, and are too large), they in no way detract from the value of the book. Professor Harrisville has here made a valuable and significant contribution to the ever expand-

ing field of studies in New Testament theology.

ROBERT A. BARTELS

Biblical Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman. Edited by J. M. Myers, O. Reimherr, and H. N. Bream. Locust Valley, New York: J. J. Augustin, 1960. 224 pages. $6.00.

This *Festschrift* forms a fitting memorial to the well-known biblical scholar and sometime professor at Gettysburg Seminary. The tribute takes the form of eight excellent studies on various topics of biblical theology, preceded by "An Appreciation" by Harry F. Baughman and a bibliography of Dr. Alleman's writings by Jacob M. Myers, both currently at Gettysburg Seminary.

The first longer selection in the volume is a work of Alleman himself, "Devotional Studies based on Psalms." Devotions are hardly written to be reviewed, but suffice it to say that a perusal of these devotions (some ninety in all) reveals both deep insight into the spirit of biblical revelation and acquaintance with contemporary biblical scholarship.

First of the other scholarly salutes is Johannes Hempel's "Die Faktizität der Geschichte im Biblischen Denken." Hempel stresses again, as a facet of ancient, biblical thought, that the original question does not deal primarily with the factuality of events but with their meaning for the questioner—and that primarily in the sphere of social relationships. In a very stimulating manner, Hempel attempts to illustrate the operation of this principle by three common motifs in Hebrew literature: rivalry, failure, and reversal (of fortunes).

In possibly the most significant study in the book, George E. Mendenhall discusses "The Relation of the Individual to Political Society in Ancient Israel." Mendenhall argues very convincingly that the corporate nature of ancient Oriental societies has been grossly exaggerated. Evidence indicates that the ancient individual was primarily a citizen of his village or clan (where he played a much more significant role) rather than of the larger political units. This helps explain both the rapid disappearance of many of the ancient empires and the survival of biblical faith through all political catastrophes. Also in Israel's religious life the individual was of great significance.

Henry S. Gehman discusses "Natural Law and the Old Testament," concluding that "the law of God as expressed in the Old Testament includes natural law, but it also transcends it" (because law is not regarded in naturalistic terms, but as having its origin in God).

As befits a tribute to a Lutheran scholar, two rewarding studies of grace in the Bible, both by Lutheran scholars, follow: Harold L. Creager's "The Grace of God in Second Isaiah" and Elmer E. Flack's "The Concept of Grace in Biblical Thought." The first of these is necessarily also a fine review of the entire theology of Deutero-Isaiah and indeed of the theology of the Old Testament. Flack's essay concentrates especially on word-studies in the vocabulary of grace in both testaments.

More in the area of textual criticism is Charles T. Fritsch's "The Concept of God in the Greek Translation of Isaiah." Numerous examples are adduced, showing how the Septuagint translator of Isaiah frequently used various devices to remove or soften anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms in the Hebrew text. That this was not done consistently, however, is probably due to the fact that he was preparing a translation, not a paraphrase.

The only essay dealing with a New Testament topic (also represented in Alleman's scholarly output) is Raymond T. Stamm's "Luke-Acts and Three Cardinal Ideas in the Gospel of John." Discussing themes which are often treated under such captions as "progressive revelation" or "revelation through history," Stamm attempts to trace the development of three themes in the thought of the early church until their consummate biblical expression in the Gospel of John: (1) the continuing presence of Jesus through the Spirit, (2) the continuing presence of Jesus and the greater works, (3) the continuing revelation and the growing life. Although this reviewer found this essay in general probably the most provoca-

tive of all, especially in connection with the doctrine of inspiration, questions are bound to arise when value-judgments are made on the basis of such reconstructions of the development of early Christian thought, especially when it is argued that "Christian eschatology is Christian only in spots—because it has not yet reconciled and committed itself to the way of the cross which is designed to draw *all* men to Jesus (italics original; a false universalism?).

Finally, Jacob M. Myers discusses "The Cultus and Its Significance," particularly in relation to Article XV of the Augsburg Confession. Myers' discussion of this thorny and volatile subject offers a fine review of many factors which must be considered in a biblical and confessional treatment of the topic. However, it seems to us to carry a needlessly anti-liturgical tone (as indicated partially by the author's approving references to L. Köhler and his judgment that the Old Testament cult "is works, not grace; an act of self-help, not a piece of God's salvation").

There is much in this volume of interest and value to nearly every Lutheran pastor and student of the Bible. Its careful study and use will inevitably contribute to the understanding and application of biblical theology—itself the highest tribute to Herbert C. Alleman.

HORACE D. HUMMEL

Paul and the Salvation of Mankind. By Johannes Munck. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959. 351 pages. $6.50.

This comprehensive study of Paul by the New Testament professor in the University of Aarhus, Denmark, is excellently translated by Frank Clarke from the original German edition of 1954, then entitled *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte.*

Based upon painstaking exegetical study (the reader should have a Greek New Testament at his side), the work discounts widely-accepted "conclusions" and "critical consensus" and pleads for a fresh approach to Paul, without the prejudice of the Baur school. The asserted aim of the book is (a) to re-examine and break the power of the Tübingen hypothesis underlying much Pauline study, and (b) to examine the place of Paul within the church's missionary activity.

Regarding the former, Munck insists that scholarship is still warped by F. C. Baur's Hegelian approach (thesis, antithesis, synthesis) which has "smothered a proper appreciation of Paul's epistles, twisted our perspective of thought and events in the early church, and stimulated a number of harassing logical fallacies." He insists that in reality there is no reactionary Jewish wing of the church opposed to a radically different Gentile church headed by Paul, for Paul was concerned about Jews and Gentiles alike, and his strategy included both. The author believes that understanding of the primitive church is distorted when it is based on an assumed contrast between Jewish and Gentile Christianity.

Regarding Paul's strategy, the argument is that the apostle and the early church both believed that the Gentiles were included in God's plan of salvation, but Jerusalem stressed the prior conversion of Israel as the prerequisite for the entry of the Gentiles, whereas Paul saw in the conversion of the Gentiles a means to provoke Israel to jealousy and to eventual acceptance of the Gospel. "The fullness of the Gentiles, which is Paul's aim, is the decisive turning-point in redemptive history. With that there begins the salvation of Israel and the coming of Antichrist, and through it the coming of Christ for judgment and salvation, and so the end of the world" (p. 49). Paul's ultimate concern, says Munck, is the salvation of Israel (Rom. 9-11), and the apostle to the Gentiles and Peter, the apostle to the circumcision, agree, while using different methods. Peter works directly with Israel while Paul, because of Israel's obduracy, goes first to the Gentiles, so that by winning them he might provoke Israel to jealousy. Paul expected, says Munck, that he himself in his own life-time would win the fullness of the Gentiles, and when he wrote Rom. 15:19 he had accomplished this in the East in a "representative" sense (Munck calls this "representative universalism," i.e. representative groups had the opportunity of making a decision for or against Christ).

Paul continues in the West this repre-

sentative evangelism, and he thus, according to Munck, becomes the center of salvation history. The author believes that the concern for Israel after the flesh has been largely forgotten (p. 281). Paul's preaching of the Gospel before the emperor would as a result penetrate to all Gentile nations. "Thus the dying apostle will see his work completed, as the fullness of the Gentiles brings about the salvation of all Israel; and that hope was Paul's strongest incentive. Now salvation is near, and Christ's coming is at the door. . . . But the fullness of the Gentiles had become a reality, and the salvation of all Israel was to be expected" (p. 334). But things did not work out that way. If Paul were wrong in this outlook, it would make us question whether he were not wrong in other parts of his teaching, and we would question whether Munck's interpretation here is valid.

Let us notice some of the characteristic interpretations of the author. The "Judaizers" are regarded as Gentile Christians who misused the Old Testament and believed that Jerusalem had a superior type of Christianity with its emphasis on law, and were not, as is commonly held, Jewish Christian messengers from the Jerusalem church. As to Corinthians, Munck says there were no "parties" at Corinth, but only misunderstandings and bickerings that arose as a result of confusing the Gospel with human wisdom, and were not from Jerusalem but of local origin. The collection among the Gentile churches, to which Paul devoted so much effort, was not intended to strengthen relations with the "mother church" in Jerusalem but was rather to fulfill the prophecies (Cf. Isa. 2:2 f.; Mic. 4:1) that Gentiles would bring gifts to Jerusalem in the last times.

Munck holds that Romans was a summary of the apostle's convictions, "a summing-up of the point of view that Paul had reached during the long struggle that begins in I Cor. and Phil. 3 (p. 199), and that the last chapter was added as a kind of introduction for Phoebe, who may have been the bearer of the letter.

He regards Paul's churches as basically Gentile churches, with very few Jewish Christians, certainly not enough to give a basis for internal divisions between Jewish and Gentile Christians.

These new interpretations will cause scholars to ask some questions about Munck's methodology, and this he expects, for he says (p. 147), "The new picture can only be a sketch, which the discussion that is to be expected is sure to modify." Can we legitimately regard Acts as a late, secondary source and always subject to Paul's letters? Why then try to harmonize it with Paul? Can we disregard recent arguments for the genuineness of I Peter as sub-apostolic and thus too late to be of value in understanding Peter's later activity?

We would also question the arbitrary handling of the text in Acts 21:20 (p. 240), where with no textual evidence he would delete the words "who had believed" in order to make the church welcome Paul gladly, while the Jews (not Jews "who believed") are ready to oppose him. One wonders, too, whether the last chapters do not picture Paul unfairly as one so concerned wth his own task in bringing in the *eschaton*, yet dying with his hopes crushed. Is this the true picture of Paul, and does this explain his urgency and universal concern as seen in Gal. 3:27 and I Cor. 12:13, which is hardly compatible with the idea of "representative" Gentiles?

Why does the author not take Colossians more seriously (he rejects Ephesians as a genuine Pauline epistle) with its universal teaching of reconciliation for all men, regardless of race? When Paul says "that we may present every man mature in Christ" (Col. 1:28), can this be interpreted as if he had the intention of saving only a few "representative" Gentiles? Here the author seems to have been very selective in the texts he chooses.

However, the value of the book cannot be minimized, and surely Pauline scholars will have to face the arguments given in their attempt better to understand early Christianity, not taking for granted the usual historical reconstructions. We cannot blindly accept the Tübingen School's emphasis on the strife between Jewish and Gentile Christians, nor on the other hand can we smooth

over the differences depicted in the text. Prof. Munck aids us to get a clearer picture of the great apostle, a better understanding of the *Sitz im Leben* in which Paul wrote his epistles, and a deeper concern for the theological issues there presented. Surely this study will help us to confront issues frequently taken for granted. It is a book scholars must consult and in which pastors will find a great challenge.

OLAF K. STORAASLI

Between the Testaments. By D. S. Russell. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960. 176 pages. $2.50.

The intertestamental period of some 300 years, usually indicated by a single blank page in most Bibles, is vague and unfamiliar to most people. However, today there is a great interest in the period because the Dead Sea literature has engaged the attention of world-wide scholarship and given us much new information, while archeological study generally has also filled in many gaps. It is important that this period be studied since both the cultural life and religious ideas of this time affected the subsequent Christian church.

While hesitating to identify the Essenes and the Qumran Covenanters (p. 55) the author here gives a popular and condensed treatment of the Hellenistic and Jewish backgrounds, the religious backgrounds of the so-called "apocalyptists," succinct summaries of the apocryphal books, and other related subjects. The Baptist author is principal and professor of Old Testament at Rawdon College, Leeds, England, and also lecturer at the university. His treatment is lucid and well-documented and will surely be of help to the curious layman as well as to many pastors who may not have other more complete resources at hand.

OLAF K. STORAASLI

The Old Testament in the Cross. By J. A. Sanders. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961. 143 pages. $3.00.

This book is an attempt to explain the scandal of the cross on the basis of the self-revelation of God in the Old Testament. The author is correct in his attitude toward the relationship of the Old to the New Testament. "The Old Testament literally saves the New Testament, as is demonstrated in church history; it saves it from mysticism; it saves it from naturalism; it saves it from gnosticism; it saves it from docetism; and it finally saves it from our shaping it into whatever happens to be our favorite philosophy as the generations come and go—Platonism, Aristotelianism, Rationalism, Existentialism, etc." (p. 15).

The author approaches the faith of the church as a history of the acts of God. This is not to say that the facts of history point to God. On the contrary God points to the facts, and there is always the possibility that the Christian is wrong in his interpretation of the facts. He must always recognize that such doubt is an integral part of faith (p. 22). Moreover, he must realize that man cannot find God; God confronts man and demands a commitment to himself and not to a set of facts.

The chapter on Creation and the Creator is the best part of the book. Although the author understands Gen. 1 as a theological apologetic rather than history, he has caught the truth of the radical faith in monotheism which pervades this account of the creation. God is God, and all else is creation which dare not be placed on God's throne.

In the following chapters Sanders shows how the Old Testament relates that man violated the distinction between God and his creation by attempting to dethrone God, while the latter violated the difference by intervening in history. The driving force in God's action was, and is, a love so great that he cannot leave man alone in his sin. This is the ultimate explanation of the cross, which is the final revelation of the love of God in judgment and salvation.

This is a good book. It came out of the author's Lenten lectures to various congregations and would be a good "refresher course" for a pastor preparing his special Lenten preaching. Do not look for a series of Lenten texts, however, since it was not the intention of the author to provide such. Look rather for a deeper understanding of the scandal, the ambiguity, and the doubts

caused by God's "left-handed" way of dealing with man through the cross.

MARTIN W. LEESBERG

The English Bible. By F. F. Bruce. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961. 248 pages. $3.75.

This is not only the year of The New English Bible but also the 350th anniversary year of the King James Version. It is therefore appropriate that books dealing with the history of the English Bible should appear on the market. The book under review here is by F. F. Bruce, the distinguished Rylands professor of Biblical Criticism, University of Manchester, England, and discusses the history of the English Bible from its earliest beginnings to the present. The chapters are arranged in a generally chronological order but with enough freedom to group related versions together. Eight plates illustrate significant events or give samples of Bible editions (but why the two most accessible ones, RSV and NEB, are reproduced rather than some less easily available ones is somewhat puzzling, even keeping in mind that the book is primarily intended for British readers).

The book bears the sub-title "A History of Translations." It is a history in the best sense, for it presents not only the external data but also the background, purpose, principles, success, and an evaluation of the various translations discussed. In each case, Bruce shows what led to the translation, especially when a group or agency instigated the work, and sets forth the principles followed in the actual translating, often in the words of the translators themselves. In his evaluations, he is by design objective; his principle could be seen in the statement, ". . . the translator's business is, as far as possible, to produce the same effect on readers of the translation as the original text produces or produced on those able to read it" (p. xii). He never judges a translator by today's standards of textual criticisms or literary taste but sees him in his own time.

While the work is very comprehensive, it cannot serve as an encyclopaedia of Bible translations (even with the index), for the reader will not find Dickinson, Ballantine, the Centenary Translation, Lamsa, Spencer, and Kleist-Lilly discussed. But unless one is a specialist, one will be well informed by this book about the history of the English Bible. The average reader might perhaps be somewhat distressed about the wide variety of Bible translations, but Bruce shows that there is a constant need for new revision, translation, and clarification and that the Bible reader can learn from each version.

WILHELM C. LINSS

Bible Guides. Edited by William Barclay and F. F. Bruce. 22 vols. No. 1: *The Making of the Bible.* By William Barclay. No. 7: *Prophets of Israel: (I) Isaiah.* By George A. F. Knight. No. 11: *The Wisdom of Israel.* By John Paterson. No. 13: *The Good News.* By C. L. Mitton. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1961. Each, 96 pages, laminated paper covers, $1.00.

Time and again the reviewer has been embarrassed by lay friends who have asked him to recommend books about the Bible. Some of them, convinced that they ought to make the Scriptures their meat and their drink, complain with a touch of bitterness that half the time they cannot make head or tail out of what they are reading. Within the past few decades ever so many commentaries and studies, designed more or less specifically to meet this need, have found their way into print. The new series, four units of which are now available, bids fair to become one of the most useful. The overall aim, as it is spelled out in the General Introduction, is "to offer a 'guide' to the main themes of each book (or group of books) rather than a commentary on the text of the book. Through Bible Guides the Bible itself will speak its message, reveal its power and declare its purpose." We are also given the assurance that "each author has worked to a comprehensive pattern so that the 22 volumes form a concise conspectus of the Bible." The series is appearing concurrently in England (Lutterworth) and the United States (Abingdon).

If the four units under review are a fair

sampling of the complete set, it should go far to provide our lay people with the help they need and want. The writers are competent and believing scholars who have deliberately put the technicalities of scholarship to the side in order to make the purpose and meaning of the Scriptures clear to the ordinary reader, though without giving the impression of condescension that sometimes mars such efforts. The "tabloid" approach has imposed serious limitations upon the writers. One could also wish that the references to the specific passages under discussion were more numerous. On the whole, however, the little volumes summarize and interpret the literature so clearly and so concisely that the act of reading them, far from becoming a chore, will be for most readers a pleasure and a benediction.

The Making of the Bible, by William Barclay, tells the long and intricate story of the canon—"how the Bible came to be what it is today" (p. 10). The subject is notoriously difficult, and books about the canon are notoriously dry. Barclay's guidebook is the exception that proves the rule. At times, as we read the section on the Old Testament, which is the most difficult chapter in the story, we seem to miss the nimble but sure-footed "Barclay" touch. One also wonders whether the opening paragraph, which purports to explain the intention of the curious but difficult saying from the *Mishnah,* "All the Holy Scriptures render the hands unclean," goes far enough to convince uninformed readers (p. 11). But when the total effect of the volume is taken into account, all such reservations seem petty and captious. Especially interesting and valuable is the graphic résumé of the difficulties that stood in the way of the production and dissemination of manuscripts in the ancient world, down to the invention of printing. Some of us are all too prone to lose sight of the crucial consideration that the Scriptures were written and the canon evolved in what was, at least for the rank and file, a "bookless" world.

We are indebted to the *Prophets of Israel,* by Prof. George Knight of McCormick Seminary, for a lucid and helpful exposition of the prophecies that have been brought together in the Book of Isaiah. Unlike some writers on the subject, Prof. Knight endeavors to interpret the oracles, not only in the light of their context in the history and faith of Israel, but also in the light of their character as superb religious poetry. Although this gives a touch of life and power to the expositions, it does not resolve all the difficulties. Isaiah was indeed the Jewish Shakespeare, but the problem of weaving the oracles that cluster around his name into an orderly and coherent exposition seems all but insuperable.

The Wisdom of Israel, by Prof. John Paterson of Drew Seminary, mints the gold in two neglected books, Job and Proverbs. The reviewer has never read a more illuminating and helpful analysis of the Book of Job. The digest of the Proverbs, steeped as it is in the conviction that they grew out of the faith of Israel, also moves on a high level. Nor will the perceptive reader fail to be thrilled by the sparkling prose in which the writer has clothed his insights. To apply to him a tribute which he pays to the masters of literature, many of his words are "winged words that have tints as well as tones, that ring like iron and shine like cloth of gold" (p. 47). The style is all the more authentic because it seems so effortless and unstudied. It is never cloying. We can only thank God that Prof. Paterson did not let his long years of teaching on this side of the Atlantic quench the ardor for good English which he brought with him from his native Scotland.

The Good News, by C. L. Mitton, distinguished and scholarly principal of the Handsworth Methodist College, is devoted largely to a running commentary, in capsule form, on our Lord's ministry as the story is told in the Synoptics, especially Mark. On rare occasions the author runs the risk of "modernizing" Jesus. He quite properly interprets the temptation experience, for example, within the framework of our Lord's mission, yet he seems to go out of his way a bit in order to give a "contemporary" slant to the individual temptations. Thus the third temptation, which was ultimately a temptation to enlist the services of Satan in order to achieve the purposes of God, becomes a temptation "to use the devil's method of mili-

tary conquest to force men to accept wise laws, and to compel them to obedience by a system of secret police" (p. 39). This criticism, if it is a criticism, only serves to show that the author, with the thought world of his readers in mind, was doing his best to speak to their condition.

The reviewer noted several minor technical lapses that should be corrected in subsequent printings. The symbol "Q" was *not* derived from *Quelle* (No. 1, p. 73). Papyrus was *not* made of the "leaves" of the papyrus plant (No. 7, p. 27).

RUSSELL D. SNYDER

Hear our Prayer: a Book of Prayers for Public Worship. By Roy Pearson. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1961. 174 pages. $3.75.

By the dean of the Andover-Newton Theological School, these prayers are thoughtful and well-expressed. They are carefully composed, not in a strict liturgical pattern, yet cast in good devotional expression.

The arrangement of the contents is according to the usual structure of worship in non-liturgical churches: vestry prayers, pastoral prayers, special occasions, prayers at the offering, prayers before and after sermon, closing prayers. These are followed by a section devoted to the "sacraments and ordinances."

In a collection of this kind "pastoral prayers" are always of special interest. Here these are not true "general intercessions" such as we know in our general prayers. They are more thematic and intimate, and occasionally a bit homiletical. They are, however, of fine quality for this type of public utterance.

GEORGE R. SELTZER

This Faith Is Mine. By R. C. Meyer. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960. 135 pages. $1.00.

One concludes that this is a private devotional manual for senior high school and older youth. It assumes that users have background acquaintance with the catechism and will use their Bibles along with the book.

Meaningful familiarity with the ecclesiastical vocabulary will be a prerequisite for satisfying experience with this guide. It is full of references to underlying theology. Beyond this, it has relevance that is refreshingly expressed: "Let's face it, you like to be led into temptation"; "prayer is . . . getting in gear with the mind of God"; "repentance is when you are sorry enough to quit." There are meditations on Apostles' Creed, baptism, communion, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer. Frequently an exercise is proposed and there are frequent injunctions to "pray about this." The young Christian's growth would most certainly follow the faithful usage of this manual.

RALPH D. HEIM

Seven Times He Spoke. By Olfert Ricard. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1960. 82 pages. $1.75.

Pastor Olfert Ricard, a persuasive Danish preacher of the first three decades of the twentieth century, here presents seven meditations based on the words from the cross. The meditations are couched in simple, narrative language intelligible to the common man, yet without glossing over the profundity of Jesus' words. Most of the insights are not new, but there is a freshness about the emphases and the applications which the author makes.

Ricard's own testimony concerning his preaching was, "I have had the joy never to enter the pulpit on a Sunday without having a very definite message to bring." Describing his twelve fruitful years of youth work, he remarked, "We only took aim and then something happened." Out of such dedication and zeal, relevant preaching is bound to flow. These seven Good Friday sermons bear witness to a consecrated herald of the cross.

CLAIR JOHNSON

The Efficiency Filing System. By L. R. Elliott. Revised edition. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1959. 67 pages. $2.00.

The busy pastor who is setting up a particular system for indexing and filing the

material he accumulates for sermon preparation and teaching will be interested in this slight but compact volume. It is a practical guide for an inexpensive system that needs no clerical help. Included are a description of an indexing system, a suggested classification of books, and a list of subject headings under which the indexing and filing can be done.

PAUL M. LINDBERG

Dogmatics. By Richard Diem. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959. 375 pages. $6.95.

This book is a translation of Diem's *Dogmatik: Ihr Weg zwischen Historismus und Existenzialismus.* As the German title indicates, Diem seeks to find a legitimate place for dogmatics in the face of its twofold decline. This he locates in the work of Troeltsch ("the end of dogmatics") and in the biblical theology connected with Bultmann. Diem is not interested in a synthesis, nor does he seek a *via media* between all the conflicting viewpoints.

Diem sets the stage for his discussion by clarifying the twofold challenge which dogmatics faces. He pays particular attention to Kierkegaard and the attempts to dissolve dogmatics in existential dialectics. Diem then moves to the dogmatic theology of Barth, accusing him of allowing only a limited amount of freedom to the biblical critic. Barth assumes the canon to be a unified and closed dogmatic whole (even though he protests that the canon is in principle open) and therefore the Scriptures stand outside the factual estimates of historical criticism. This is to emphasize dogmatics at the expense of Scripture and history and, according to Diem, it is an attempt to find the wrong place for dogma. Bultmann, too, is critically examined, and his place for dogmatics is located between the kerygma of Scripture and the hearer's own existential situation. This again is the wrong place for dogma, since on Bultmann's own presuppositions dogmatics is dissolved in a maze of subjectivism. Between Barth and Bultmann there is no common ground, nor is it possible to find a common basis for discussion between them.

After placing the situation in what the author deems its proper context, Diem moves to a consideration of the historical Jesus for the preaching, doctrine, and faith of the church. There is a particularly acute discussion of radical form criticism and the reactions to it, especially among European Lutherans. Various ideas of doctrine are also discussed, with particular emphasis on the doctrinal aspects of preaching.

Diem spends the balance of the last half of his book on the problems connected with Scripture and exegesis. The problems of the canon and the unity of Scripture are closely examined. The book concludes with Diem's estimate of dogmatics in the life of the contemporary church. This he sees in the role dogmatics must play in scriptural exposition. The last chapter is an application of this role of dogmatics to specific situations of exegesis: predestination, the descent into hell, and the ascension of Christ.

RICHARD WERNER

Divine Election. By G. C. Berkouwer. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960. 336 pages. $4.50.

This volume is one of twenty *Studies in Dogmatics* projected by the well-known professor of Systematic Theology of the Free University of Amsterdam. Seven of the volumes are now available, the rest are in preparation. The series will cover all the significant theological topics from creation to eschatology.

Perhaps because of the influence of the rationalistic element of Arminianism, Lutherans have recently been somewhat embarrassed by the doctrine of divine election, with the result that seldom is any reference made to it in preaching. This has had an unfortunate consequence in the area of the relationship between infant baptism and confirmation. Historically speaking, failure to understand Luther's emphasis on divine election and the enslavement of the will has forced many Lutherans to follow Melanchthon into the wastelands of an unbiblical conception of conversion based on false anthropological presuppositions. If infant

baptism is not related to the prevenient grace of God (another way of saying divine election), then it must seek its explanation in a doctrine of man.

The usefulness of the present volume lies in the fact that it provides new answers by asking new questions. Many, particularly those who feel with Wesley that the doctrine of election cuts the taproot of preaching, will find the chapter "Election and the Preaching of the Gospel" a real challenge. "But the Church does not, because of the world's sin, stop preaching salvation, and it does not therefore abandon the world. It may not do that on the basis of election, since the Church itself knows that it too has been called out of darkness into the light by a free and sovereign election" (p. 253).

The meat of the volume is perhaps found in the chapter "Election in Christ." Luther related the doctrine of election to the doctrine of justification (*sola gratia*), thereby simply underscoring three times the fact that the sinner is saved by grace. Berkouwer sees Jesus Christ as "truly the mirror of election." For this reason, he points out, "the pastoral message finds in Him an immovable foundation." "To say that God's counsel is eternal is not to make it remote, but to guarantee the inviolable reality of what is near. Hiddenness is not placed in contrast to revelation here, but the mystery of the will of God is forever made free from all contingence and arbitrariness" (p. 171).

For those who misuse and abuse the doctrine of election the author issues a stern warning. Only a misunderstanding of this doctrine can lead a man to take his election for granted and to make of it an occasion for subtle self-justification. This happens when being elected is "abstracted from the grace of God and from His gracious election." It happens also when the individual is isolated from the community. However, says Berkouwer, "the election in Christ can never be placed in an individualistic or collectivistic framework" (p. 310). The proper understanding of "people of God" serves to fulfill and enrich the believer's individuality, not to narrow or destroy it. Ultimately, the misconception of this doctrine of election, the author points out, is not just an intellectual error which does not see the correlations in the Word of God but a revelation of the craftiness of the human heart which constantly seeks "an excuse for no longer living exclusively by the grace of God" (p. 329).

WALTER J. KUKKONEN

The Humanity of God. By Karl Barth. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1960. 96 pages. $2.50.

Those who have known only Barth's emphasis upon the "otherness of God" have often accused him of annihilating man. Such readers are now greeting with enthusiasm the "new Barth" who writes *The Humanity of God.* In reality there is very little in this delightful volume which is not previewed in Barth's weightier volumes of *Church Dogmatics.* Therefore it is hardly fair to assume that Barth has suddenly reversed his field and is now become interested in the meaning of the incarnation in terms of its implications for a Christian anthropology.

It is gladly acknowledged, however, that the accent in this little volume falls more sharply and delightfully upon the significance of Christ, the man. He acknowledges our indebtedness to the liberal theologians of the nineteenth century who, in acts "of spiritual steadfastness were not afraid to face this modern man" (p. 16), i.e. the man who was the object of the quest for the historical Jesus. Barth believes that in its attempt to confront the contemporary age, the nineteenth century theologians erred in that they made the contemporary age decisive for their concern rather than the objective revelation of God *and man* in Christ. This led them to concentrate more upon the benefits bestowed upon man through Christ than upon Christ himself. The general framework of their discussion was developed from the direction of a "man to God" relationship without the realization that this is always a consequent of the "God to man" relationship. In short, theology began with man and worked toward God, whereas Barth would have us begin with God and work toward man. Within this framework, the person of Jesus Christ, i.e. his humanity, becomes exceedingly meaning-

ful for a full and adequate understanding of man.

It would be unfair to expose all of Barth's delightful insights lest the review be a substitute for the book. But, as a Lutheran somewhat conditioned to be sceptical of Barth, it may not be amiss to point out that his views of Luther are often less clear and valid than his views of his beloved Calvin. At one point (p. 45) he implies that a new doctrine of the "autonomy of man" might result from his present emphasis, and from it a secularism "in the sense of the Lutheran doctrine of the two kingdoms." Barth certainly ought to know that Luther's understanding of the two regimes cannot be equated with any doctrine of the autonomy of man. Rather it is an expression of man's inescapable accountability to God for all his acts, in whatever realms they be performed.

To detract from the joy of the reader who reads this work would be criminal. It is deserving of thorough study, and reading these pages will be an enriching experience to all who take even a little time for careful study.

ARNOLD E. CARLSON

The Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr. By Gordon Harland. New York: Oxford, 1960. 298 pages. $6.00.

Although in continual dialogue with modern society for the past three decades, America's most influential theologian has never had the time (or the interest) to write a systematic account of his theological and ethical thought. Fortunately for Reinhold Niebuhr, some of his dedicated disciples are now screening a life-time's production of books, essays, and articles in order to do this for him. Harland's careful study is one of the most successful of these attempts.

The book is divided into two major divisions. Part I outlines the structure of Niebuhr's theological ethic and Part II analyzes his views on a great number of practical issues in the areas of politics, economics, war, and race relations. In the course of the presentation, Harland seeks to defend Niebuhr against two common accusations: (1) that there is no organic unity between his theological principles and his political practices; (2) that Niebuhr is strong as a prophet, tearing down current idols, but weak as a priest helping his people to worship and to serve the one true God.

One leaves the book with the distinct impression that like many another preacher (for that is his unique calling), Niebuhr may be judged explicitly guilty but implicitly innocent on both counts. The strong bond which connects Niebuhr's thought and action is his insistence upon the mutual interaction of Christian love and social justice. Love demands, negates, and fulfills justice. Justice without love ceases to be justice and degenerates into a mere balance of power. Love without justice ceases to be love and degenerates into vague sentimentalism.

Nevertheless, in terms of systematic wholeness, Niebuhr's position suffers from a relative paucity of distinctively Christian resources in his theological foundations for social ethical service. Though his own spirit is evangelically cross-centered, Niebuhr's doctrines of the Holy Spirit, the church, the means of grace, and the relation of justification to sanctification are conspicuously weak. Harland does develop Niebuhr's characteristic treatments of humility, tolerance, irony, and the nonchalance of faith, but it is hard to see what Jesus had to add to Jeremiah and Jefferson for such an orientation.

Hence, while Niebuhr is not nearly so careful about distinguishing between the law's civil righteousness and the gospel's Christian righteousness as either Brunner or Luther (two of his favorite targets), it must be said that his ambiguity at just this point has gained him the hearing and cooperation of men of good will from all walks of life who can often agree with his social analyses and remedies whether they are Christians or not.

WILLIAM H. LAZARETH

Process and Reality. By Alfred N. Whitehead. New York: MacMillan Co., 1960. 545 pages. $6.50.

The appearance of a fifth printing of Whitehead's *Process and Reality* (almost simultaneous with a paperback edition) is

sufficient evidence that this difficult *Essay in Cosmology* (sub-title) still attracts readers. The reason for this is clear: The difficulty of the book is matched by its importance. Ten years after the first edition of *Process and Reality* (1929), E. A. Burtt wrote that it "is one of the most difficult philosophical books ever written. . . ." James Collins has recently attested to its importance: "One of the few metaphysical masterpieces produced by our century."

For those interested in the religious implications of Whitehead's thought, this book, his major philosophical work, cannot be avoided. His shorter writing, *Religion in the Making*, is certainly more "readable," but it is doubtful that anyone who does not have imaginative powers and a command of philosophy equal to Whitehead's could properly understand his position in this smaller book without first struggling through *Process and Reality*.

Whitehead's process philosophy, or philosophy of organism, has had a marked influence on some contemporary theologians, not only in being recognized as a position to be contended with but also in being accepted as the most adequate philosophical system for the expression of Christian theology. The writings of Daniel Day Williams, Henry Nelson Wieman, Bernard E. Meland, Bernard Loomer, and Harold A. Bosley indicate the seriousness of the attempts made to formulate a process theology based on Whitehead. To a lesser extent, Nels F. S. Ferre and, in England, Lionel S. Thornton also illustrate the influence of Whitehead on theology. The work of Charles Hartshorne in philosophy of religion provides a helpful Whiteheadian bridge from process philosophy to process theology.

Whitehead was a man of wide-ranging knowledge and interests and is probably known better by the general public for his writing in fields other than philosophy and religion. It is also no doubt true that he is more widely quoted than read. But for those who wish to undertake a serious study of Whitehead, *Process and Reality* will continue to be the most important of his writings.

CARL FJELLMAN

History of Christianity in the Middle Ages: From the Fall of Rome to the Fall of Constantinople. By William R. Cannon. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960. 352 pages. $4.50.

The dean of Candler School of Theology, Emory University, has drawn on his experiences as a teacher, his travels abroad, and his wide familiarity with the sources of church history in the Middle Ages in presenting his well balanced textbook. Although the volume is thoroughly documented, the text is devoid of pedantry and reads like a well plotted story. It is refreshing, for example, to have the well known account of one of the events in the fall of Rome rendered in such a striking sentence as "When . . . the beardless boy, Romulus Augustulus, had the imperial crown taken from his head and placed on the head of the hairy barbarian, Odovacer, the world of both Roman and Christan antiquity was dead. . . ."

The history of medieval Christianity is divided into twelve chapters, covering as the main periods the account from the fall of Rome to the time of Gregory I and Justinian; the growth of the papacy and the doctrinal divisions in the East; the Carolingian Renaissance and Byzantine Christianity in the eighth and ninth centuries; the Great Schism; the Gregorian reforms, investiture conflict, growth of monasticism, and the first crusades; the brilliance of twelfth-century Europe; the thirteenth century with the culmination of papal authority, the flowering of scholasticism, and the decline of the Eastern Church; and Christendom during the century and a half before the fall of Constantinople. By moving back and forth between West and East in every major section, the author makes one aware of the connections, similarities, and differences between the two big divisions in Christendom while furthering a good sense of chronology. Christian events and leaders are discussed against the background of political, social, and cultural developments.

The author is best in drawing character sketches of outstanding leaders and explaining developments in theology. He seems somewhat less successful in clarifying the

intricacies of medieval scholasticism. More space might have been given to medieval preaching, the development of liturgies, and the impact of Christianity on the culture of the period. The work will prove valuable to the lay reader as well as the college or seminary student.

HAROLD J. GRIMM

A Historical Approach to the New Testament. By Frederic R. Crownfield. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960. 422 pages. $5.50.

Expressly geared to meet the needs of college students, this new book serves as a clear and incisive treatment in New Testament introduction that should be welcomed enthusiastically by all who are seeking to appreciate or convey the applicability of historical methods to biblical studies. Professor Crownfield has candidly analyzed and illustrated the problems, the conclusions, and the significance of New Testament research in language that is readily understood or amply defined, and with a style that is appealing to the non-specialist. His main emphasis ". . . is intended to be on what the authors of the various parts of the New Testament were trying to say" (p. xi). Historical method is made the tool for developing afresh an honest portrayal of the New Testament message. Crownfield has rightly honored the necessary task of presenting the history of the New Testament, the formation of the canon, and the history of the canonical text as a purely historical one, but he identifies that undertaking, as Aage Bentzen does in his Old Testament introduction, with the theological task. Its goal is ". . . to understand 'the human side' of the document of Revelation" (see Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament,* Vol. I, 1958, p. 18).

The introduction of the book comprises a definition of the New Testament in terms of the development of the canon, a description of the historical approach, an analysis of the aims and accomplishments of textual criticism, and the problems of translation. The findings of the introductory essays are then employed in an analysis of the life and teachings of Jesus, the development of Christianity within the Graeco-Roman world (as viewed mainly through the notices of the life and the letters of Paul), and the characteristics of books which arose out of the life of the churches whose members were faced with the problems of the larger world. The sources are surveyed and evaluated, the backgrounds delineated, and the teachings of New Testament writers weighed in terms of their origins, environment, development, and distinctive contributions. The student is led to an awareness of problems faced by the interpreter in handling his sources. The synoptic problem, the historical value of the Fourth Gospel, the application of form criticism as a means of testing historical data, the function of oral tradition in the process of canonization, and a critique for establishing the reliability of tradition, the geographical, political, economic, and religious situation of the Jews, and the characteristics of Judaism are quite fully surveyed before the career and teachings of Jesus are discussed. The novice in the field of historical methodology may find some difficulty facing the conclusion, offered on that basis, that an exact chronology of Jesus' ministry cannot be gleaned from the gospels, or that the originality of Jesus' teachings consists not in novelty but in insight in selecting the "essential from the matrix" of current teachings (p. 184), or that statements ascribed to Jesus may be supported by indecisive evidence; but he will be led, hopefully, to clearer insights into the features which are vital to an understanding of Jesus' life, to an appreciation of his essential message, and to positive reaction to the ultimate questions, "Was this life and this teaching the expression, under the condition of human life, of what God really is? Was Jesus' very humanity divine?" (p. 189). The same critical acumen is applied to the study of the activities and basic convictions of Jesus' followers, Jews and Hellenists, of Palestine and from abroad.

As Christianity spread beyond Jewish circles of thought it faced, inevitably, the environment of the Graeco-Roman world. Some aquaintance with political policies, the role of religion (ancient cults, emperor wor-

ship, astralism, the Mysteries, Gnosis), philosophy, and the general syncretism of the age must be had to appreciate the work of men like Paul and his followers. The Book of Acts, the Pauline and deutero-Pauline letters, the catholic epistles, and the Book of Revelation must be understood in the light of the development of the church in this new setting. Before essaying to present the career, the letters, and the teachings of Paul and the contributions of other writers, Professor Crownfield supplies a fine modicum to such acquaintance and understanding on the part of the student. Two fine chapters, "Christianity and the State" and "Development of Organization," are concrete examples of more specialized topical studies included in the book.

The publisher is to be commended for excellence in choice of paper and binding, format, and typographical setting. The book is amply illustrated with ten maps, one chart, and sixty-three halftones. Not least in value are the appended suggestions for further reading.

The book may be heartily endorsed as a textbook for colleges, a preliminary guide for seminary students, a "refresher" for pastors, and a standard reference for Sunday school and church libraries. It should prove a help in closing the hiatus which persists between historical studies and devotional reading of the New Testament.

NORMAN K. BAKKEN

The Word of the Lord Grows. By Martin H. Franzmann. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1961. $4.00.

This book is an introduction to the literature of the New Testament. The author makes a serious attempt to show the historical setting, author, date, purpose, and content for each of the New Testament writings.

The avowed aim of the author is "to produce a book which would leave the student, for the first, alone with his New Testament" (Preface). Apparently this means that he wishes to make it possible for the student to be able to read his New Testament sensibly without the aid of a commentary. The aim is good, but it is questionable whether the present-day student will develop the habit of reading his New Testament at all simply by reading a book about it.

The author's position on questions of dating and authorship is generally conservative. He rejects the two-source theory for the Synoptics, accepts the very early date for Matthew, and believes that all the twenty-seven books of the New Testament were composed before A. D. 100. Unfortunately, the author's conclusions are stated without documentation either for or against. For this reason the book seems to be unsatisfactory for seminary students. Perhaps the layman might begin with this book, but certainly he, too, has the right to know about opposing views.

N. LEROY NORQUIST

Index to Volume XIII

I. AUTHORS AND SUBJECTS

ALLBECK, WILLARD D.
A Journal of Samuel Mau, 1794-1795 ... 155
Reviews of: Shepherd, ed., *The Eucharist and Liturgical Renewal* ... 280
Shepherd, *The Reform of Liturgical Worship* ... 280

ARDEN, G. EVERETT
Review of: Nelson and Fevold, *Lutheran Church among Norwegian-Americans* ... 275

ARNOLD, ARTHUR O.
Reviews of: Berner, *Fulfill Thy Ministry* ... 190
Garrison, *Creative Imagination in Preaching* ... 282
Reu, *Thomasius Old Testament Selections* ... 190

BACHMANN, E. THEODORE
Reviews of: Doberstein, ed., *A Lutheran Prayer Book* ... 284
Stevenson, *The Story of the Reformation* ... 278

BACKUS, WILLIAM
A Study of Contemporary Lutheran Preaching ... 322

BAKKEN, NORMAN K.
Review of: Grobel, *The Gospel of Truth* ... 84

BARTELS, ROBERT A.
Reviews of: Grant, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus* ... 83
Harrisville, *Newness in the New Testament* ... 361
The New English Bible: The New Testament ... 269

BASS, GEORGE M.
Reviews of: Fackre, *The Purpose and Work of the Ministry* ... 188
Hageman, *We Call This Friday Good* ... 189

BELGUM, DAVID
Reviews of: Dresner, *Three Paths of God and Man* ... 185
Martinson, *Marriage and the American Ideal* ... 74
Telfer, *The Forgiveness of Sins* ... 185

BERGENDOFF, CONRAD
Christian Love and Public Policy in Luther ... 218
Theology, the Church, and the University ... 3

BREAM, HOWARD N.
Reviews of: Childs, *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament* ... 79
Leupold, *Exposition of the Psalms* ... 81

CARLSON, ARNOLD E.
Reviews of: Barth, *The Humanity of God* ... 370
Barth, *Protestant Thought from Rousseau to Ritschl* ... 278
Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation* ... 283

COOPER, JOHN C.
Reviews of: Lehmann, ed., *Meaning and Practice of the Lord's Supper* ... 279
Morrison, *The Powers That Be* ... 272

DEIBERT, JOSEPH H.
Thou Shalt Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself ... 67

EMMERS, EDWARD
Did Luther Advocate Feeding Faith on Christ's Testament? ... 173

ERLING, BERNHARD
The Confessions in the Church of Sweden ... 255

FJELLMAN, CARL
Reviews of: Baly, *Academic Illusion* ... 285
Whitehead, *Process and Reality* ... 371

FORELL, GEORGE W.
Reviews of: Elmen, *The Restoration of Meaning to Contemporary Life* ... 182
Miegge, *Christian Affirmations in a Secular Age* ... 182

GRIMM, HAROLD J.
Review of: Cannon, *History of Christianity in the Middle Ages* ... 372

GRISLIS, EGIL
The Arnoldshain Theses on the Lord's Supper in Recent Discussion 333
HALS, RONALD
The Problem of Old Testament Hermeneutics 97
HEFNER, PHILIP J.
Albrecht Ritschl and his Current Critics 103
HEIM, RALPH D.
Review of: Meyer, *This Faith Is Mine* 368
HEINECKEN, MARTIN J.
Reviews of: Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man* 77
Scharlemann, ed., *What, Then, Is Man?* 75
HERTZ, KARL H.
Reviews of: Kloetzli, *The City Church: Death or Renewal* 357
Winter, *The Suburban Captivity of the Churches* 357
HOLMER, PAUL L.
Review of: Ellul, *The Theological Foundation of Law* 274
HORN, WILLIAM M.
The Image of the Ministry 193
HUMMEL, HORACE D.
Review of: Myers et al., eds., *Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman* 362
JENSON, ROBERT W.
Liberating Truth and Liberal Education 211
JOHNSON, CLAIR
Reviews of: Beck and Hansen, *The Crowds Around Calvary* 283
Ricard, *Seven Times He Spoke* 368
KANTONEN, T. A.
Reviews of: Every, *The Baptismal Sacrifice* 187
Littell, *The German Phoenix* 359
Porter, *The Day of Light* 187
KRODEL, GOTTFRIED G.
The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Young Luther 19
KUKKONEN, WALTER J.
Review of: Berkouwer, *Divine Election* 369
LAZARETH, WILLIAM H.
A Reply on the Relation of Word and Sacrament in Luther 173
Review of: Harland, *The Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr* 371
LEESBURG, MARTIN W.
Review of: Sanders, *The Old Testament in the Cross* 365
LEHMANN, MARTIN E.
Movement Toward the Mind of Christ 165
LINDBERG, PAUL M.
Reviews of: Elliott, *The Efficiency Filing System* 368
Girgensohn, *Teaching Luther's Catechism, II* 281
Holt, *Handbook of Church Finance* 190
Tournier, *Vara Roller och Vi Sjalva* 282
Walker, *The Human Problems of the Minister* 188
White, *Soul and Psyche* 186
LINNS, WILHELM C.
Review of: Bruce, *The English Bible* 366
LOTZ, BENJAMIN
An Appraisal of the Hymn Texts in the Service Book and Hymnal 113
LUND, DONIVER A.
Review of: Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace* 184
LUND, GENE
A Short-Range Ecumenical Blueprint 262
LUND, L. DALE
Reviews of: Forell et al., *Luther and Culture* 360
Harkness, *The Providence of God* 92
LUNDEEN, LYMAN
Review of: Ferré, *Language, Logic, and God* 183
MARSHALL, ROBERT
Reviews of: Muckle, *Isaiah 1–39* 80
Thexton, *Isaiah 40–66* 80
MARTINSON, FLOYD M.
Reviews of: Berry, *High Is the Wall* 93
Mace and Mace, *Marriage East and West* 75

MELCHERT, NORMAN
Reflections on the Place of Theology in the University ... 266
MEUSER, FRED W.
Reviews of: Osborn, *The Spirit of American Christianity* ... 91
Payne, *The Holy Fire* ... 87
MILTON, J. P.
Review of: Wehrli, *From Patriarch to Prophet* ... 284
MORENTZ, PAUL E.
Review of: Young and Meiberg, *Spiritual Therapy* ... 73
NELSON, E. CLIFFORD
Review of: Swihart, *Luther and the Lutheran Church* ... 276
NORQUIST, LEROY
Review of: Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* ... 271
REUMANN, JOHN
Retreat from the Word or Return to It? ... 308
ROTH, ROBERT PAUL
Review of: Sellers, *The Outsider and the Word of God* ... 356
SCHEIDT, DAVID L.
Recent Linguistic Transition in Lutheranism ... 34
SCHMIDT, JOHN
Preaching at Funerals ... 249
SELTZER, GEORGE R.
Reviews of: Guptill, *Contemporary Pastoral Prayers* ... 285
Pearson, *Hear Our Prayer* ... 368
Rodenmayer, *The Pastor's Prayerbook* ... 284
SHERMAN, FRANKLIN
Christian Love and Public Policy Today ... 229
SMITH, JACK EVERETT
The Contradiction Called Man ... 239
SNYDER, RUSSELL D.
Review of: Barclay and Bruce, eds., *Bible Guides* ... 366
STENSVAAG, JOHN
Review of: Hopkin, *The Watchman* ... 92
STORAASLI, OLAF K.
Reviews of: Blair, *Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew* ... 181
Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* ... 363
Russell, *Between the Testaments* ... 365
STRENG, WILLIAM D.
Review of: Smart, *The Rebirth of the Ministry* ... 73
TAPPERT, THEODORE G.
Reviews of: Mayer, ed., *Cranmer's Selected Writings* ... 286
Ziel, *The Natural Sciences and the Christian Message* ... 78
WENTZ, FREDERICK K.
The Ecumenical Movement as Fulfillment of the Reformation ... 289
Review of: Murray, *We Hold These Truths* ... 273
WERNER, RICHARD
Review of: Diem, *Dogmatics* ... 369
WOLF, CARL UMHAU
Ecumenicity at the Grass Roots ... 298
Reform in Roman Catholicism ... 47
WOLF, H. H.
The Bossey Graduate School of Ecumenical Studies ... 177
ZINGER, D. H.
Review of: Rexine, *Religion in Plato and Cicero* ... 85
ZUCKER, WOLFGANG M.
Reviews of: Collins, *God in Modern Philosophy* ... 88
Cullman, *The Christology of the New Testament* ... 86
Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* ... 87

II. BOOKS REVIEWED

Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace* ... 184
Baly, *Academic Illusion* ... 285
Barclay and Bruce, eds., *Bible Guides* ... 366

Barth, *The Humanity of God* 370
———, *Protestant Thought from Rousseau to Ritschl* 278
Beck, *The Crowds Around Calvary* 283
Berkouwer, *Divine Election* 369
Berner, *Fulfill Thy Ministry* 190
Berry, *High Is the Wall* 93
Blair, *Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew* 181
Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* 271
Bruce, *The English Bible* 366
Cannon, *History of Christianity in the Middle Ages* 372
Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man* 77
Childs, *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament* 79
Collins, *God in Modern Philosophy* 88
Crownfield, *Historical Approach to the New Testament* 373
Cullman, *The Christology of the New Testament* 86
Diem, *Dogmatics* 369
Doberstein, ed., *A Lutheran Prayer Book* 284
Dressner, *Three Paths of God* 185
Elliott, *The Efficiency Filing System* 368
Ellul, *The Theological Foundation of Law* 274
Elmen, *The Restoration of Meaning to Contemporary Life* 182
Every, *The Baptismal Sacrifice* 187
Fackre, *The Purpose and Work of the Ministry* 188
Ferré, *Language, Logic, and God* 183
Forell et al., *Luther and Culture* 360
Franzmann, *The Word of the Lord Grows* 374
Garrison, *Creative Imagination in Preaching* 282
Girgensohn, *Teaching Luther's Catechism, II* 281
Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* 87
———, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus* 83
Grobel, *The Gospel of Truth* 84
Guptill, *Contemporary Pastoral Prayers* 285
Hageman, *We Call This Friday Good* 189
Harkness, *The Providence of God* 92
Harland, *The Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr* 371
Harrisville, *Newness in the New Testament* 361
Holt, *Handbook of Church Finance* 190
Hopkin, *The Watchman* 92
Kloetzli, *The City Church: Death or Renewal* 357
Lehmann, ed., *Meaning and Practice of the Lord's Supper* 279
Leupold, *Exposition of the Psalms* 81
Littell, *The German Phoenix* 359
Macartney, *The Making of a Minister, an Autobiography* 286
Mace and Mace, *Marriage East and West* 75
Martinson, *Marriage and the American Ideal* 74
Mayer, *Cranmer's Selected Writings* 286
Meyer, *This Faith Is Mine* 368
Miegge, *Christian Affirmations in a Secular Age* 182
Morrison, *The Powers That Be* 272
Muckle, *Isaiah 1-39* 80
Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* 363
Murray, *We Hold These Truths* 273
Myers et al., *Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman* 362
Nelson and Fevold, *Lutheran Church among Norwegian-Americans* 275
The New English Bible: The New Testament 269
Osborn, *The Spirit of American Christianity* 91
Payne, *The Holy Fire* 88
Pearson, *Hear Our Prayer* 368
Porter, *The Day of Light* 187
Reu, *Thomasius Old Testament Selections* 190
Rexine, *Religion in Plato and Cicero* 85
Ricard, *Seven Times He Spoke* 368
Rodenmayer, *The Pastor's Prayerbook* 284
Russell, *Between the Testaments* 365
Sanders, *The Old Testament in the Cross* 365

charlemann, ed., *What, Then, Is Man?* 75
ellers, *The Outsider and the Word of God* 356
hepherd, ed., *The Eucharist and Liturgical Renewal* 280
——, *The Reform of Liturgical Worship* 280
mart, *The Rebirth of Ministry* 73
tevenson, *The Story of the Reformation* 278
wihart, *Luther and the Lutheran Church* 276
elfer, *The Forgiveness of Sins* 185
hexton, *Isaiah 40-66* 80
ournier, *Vara Roller och Vi Sjalva* 282
Valker, *The Human Problems of the Minister* 188
Vehrli, *From Patriarch to Prophet* 284
White, *Soul and Psyche* 168
Whitehead, *Process and Reality* 371
Vingren, *Man and the Incarnation* 283
Vinter, *The Suburban Captivity of the Churches* 357
Young and Merberg, *Spiritual Therapy* 73
Ziel, *The Natural Sciences and the Christian Message* 78